

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6149. Also, petition of Carrie E. Spaid and 7 other citizens of Martindale, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6150. Also, petition of Pvt. Vernon O. Wethey and 25 other citizens of Fresno, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6151. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank Cash and 13 other citizens of Cincinnati, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6152. Also, petition of Nona Lee and 12 other citizens of Rockford, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6153. Also, petition of W. J. Wildman and 16 other citizens of Pitcher, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6154. Also, petition of Elizabeth E. Lown and 13 other citizens of Rhinebeck, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6155. Also, petition of Rose Nelsen and 25 other citizens of Minden, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6156. Also, petition of Miss Emma Rudd and 26 other citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6157. Also, petition of A. A. Douglas and 25 other citizens of Lansing, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6158. Also, petition of Rev. R. E. DeKay and 34 other citizens of Warwick, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6159. Also, petition of Anna M. Fraser and 52 other citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6160. Also, petition of Anne C. Craven and 43 other citizens of DeLand, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6161. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by 300 residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6162. Also, petition signed by 200 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6163. Also, petition signed by 600 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6164. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Lucille White, of Camden, W. Va., and 22 other citizens of Lewis County, W. Va., urging the enactment of House bill 682 (the Johnson bill) prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertisement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6165. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, requesting a review, by the proper officials of the United States Government, of the reports on Toledo Harbor, Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this hour of the world's desperate need we turn to Thee, mindful of our insufficiency. We are but broken reeds lashed by wild winds that mock our boasting pride uttered in days of calm; the arm of flesh is futile. Thou only art a covert from the wind, a shelter

from the storm, the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Thine alone, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the majesty and the victory; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine. Thine is the kingdom and Thou art exalted as head above all.

With that flaming vision of the Holy One high and lifted up, we come in deep humility, for the contrite heart is Thy only dwelling. We ask only that our hearts, emptied of dross, may burn with Thy presence; that our faith, purged of unbelief, may flame with hope undimmed; that Thy strength may be made perfect in our weakness; and that the music of Thy victory may bring songs to our darkest night. We ask it in the Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 19, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 725. An act to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws;

S. 1807. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.;

S. 2028. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, and the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to permit service of members of the Women's Reserve in the American area, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for naming the lake formed by waters of the Red River impounded by Denison Dam.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 4697. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1030);

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations;

H. R. 5232. An act to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery,

Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) authorizing that the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents be published as a document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2707) for the relief of Henry White, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REPORTS OF BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH UNDER TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate 13 letters from the Board of Investigation and Research under the Transportation Act of 1940, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of its studies on the following subjects: Federal Regulatory Restrictions Upon Motor and Water Carriers; The National Traffic Pattern; The Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation; A Carload Traffic Study, 1939; Technological Trends in Transportation; Practices and Procedures of Governmental Control of Transportation; Public Aids to Domestic Transportation; Taxation of Carriers by Federal, State, and Local Governments; Interstate Trade Barriers Affecting Motor-Vehicle Transportation; The Economics of Coal Traffic Flow; Railroad Consolidation and Employee Welfare; Comparisons of Rail, Motor, and Water Carrier Costs; and a final report on the Relative Economy and Fitness of the Carriers, which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4625. An act to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108).

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 5255. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1110).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3270. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1112).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of Frank Henderson and Frances Nell Henderson, his wife; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113);

H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Recely and Mary T. Recely; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114);

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Charles Fred Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115);

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Bucey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116);

H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of the Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1117);

H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Roberta Ramsey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118);

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119);

H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1120);

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of James Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1121);

H. R. 2873. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122);

H. R. 3101. A bill for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123);

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Rely; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124); and

H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Conrad H. Clark; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1126);

H. R. 2624. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127); and

H. R. 2874. A bill for the relief of Robert Will Starks; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1128).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Clark; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1130);

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cleo B. Hunt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131); and

H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1132).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1133).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1774. A bill for the relief of Cyri Doerner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134);

H. R. 2845. A bill for the relief of John J. Beaton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135);

H. R. 3595. A bill for the relief of Robert Futterman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136);

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Frank Gay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1137); and

H. R. 4712. A bill for the relief of John Duncan McDonald; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2031. A bill for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1139).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4163. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1140).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 5196. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141).

PROHIBITION OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RACE, CREED, COLOR, AND SO FORTH

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2048) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and I submit a report (No. 1109) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. While the committee unanimously voted to report the bill to the Senate, there were several members of the committee who indicated that they might submit amendments to the bill before it was considered. It was also suggested, and it meets with the approval of the Senator who is now reporting the bill, that the bill be not taken up before the coming election. I ask if that meets with the approval of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. It does.

RELIEF OF BEARDSTOWN, ILL.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been directed by the chairman of the Committee on Claims to report favorably with an amendment on House bill 4931, and I submit a report (No. 1111) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this bill was unanimously ordered reported by the Committee on Claims this morning. It came over from the House of Representatives where it was unanimously passed. It proposes an appropriation of \$65,000 to help the town of Beardstown, Ill., build a span to a bridge which was recently destroyed by a naval vessel which ran against the fenders of the bridge as it went down the Illinois River. Beardstown has a population of only about 5,000 people, and cannot go ahead and build a new span without this claim being paid. The Navy Department, over the signature of the Secretary of the Navy whose letter is found in the report, admits negligence, and recommends that the bill be passed in the amount of \$65,000. No one has objected to it either in the House or in the Senate. The money is needed, and the committee feels it is important that the bill be passed now. A camp is located nearby and the bridge is a part of the

main section of a highway. I ask that the bill be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Claims was, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$65,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably Senate Resolution 329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

I should like to say in explanation that the resolution provides for printing of 2,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings before the special committee to study and survey problems of small-business enterprises. There has been a tremendous demand for the hearings before the committee, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is chairman of the committee, said that he could not supply the demand unless when hearings are printed the committee be allowed to print an additional 2,000 copies at the run of the press, which makes it much less expensive to do than to go back for a reprint.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this is a request for the printing of 2,000 copies additional to those which have already been authorized?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; from now on, when the committees hold hearings, the committee is entitled to print 1,000 copies. One thousand copies is not sufficient to meet the demand. The resolution would provide authority that when they go to press 3,000 copies of the hearings be printed instead of 1,000 copies.

Mr. WHITE. That is quite a substantial increase.

Mr. HAYDEN. The subject of small business, as the Senator knows, is of very widespread interest throughout the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 329), submitted by Mr. CHAVEZ (for Mr. MURRAY) on September 19, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, authorized by Senate Resolution 66, Seventy-eighth Congress (extending S. Res. 298, 76th Cong.), be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 2,000 additional copies of each part of its hearings.

REGULATION OF THE INSURANCE BUSINESS—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted

the views of the minority of that committee on the bill (S. 3270) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1112.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 19, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct, and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes;

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution making an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States January 20, 1945.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 2159. A bill creating an Office of Naval Research, Development, and Patents in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 2160. A bill authorizing the promotion of Rear Admiral Harold Gardiner Bowen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2161. A bill to correct the military record of Charles C. Fenwick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2162. A bill to provide for the refund of all penalties paid with respect to the 1941 and 1942 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON) introduced Senate bill 2163, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2164. A bill repealing subsection (c) of section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932, relating to the determination of the class of post offices; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 2165. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Gila reclamation project, Arizona, to the University of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

INCORPORATION OF THE MEDICAL WOMEN, ARMY-NAVY CLUB

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself I ask consent to introduce a bill to incorporate the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club, and I request that this measure may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2163) to incorporate the Medical Women,

Army-Navy Club, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill has been prepared by a group of patriotic ladies in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States for the purpose of providing a living memorial to the Army and Navy nurses in the Army, in the Navy, in the Air Corps, and in the Marine Corps, who are serving in World War No. 2 upon the battle fronts.

After World War No. 1 some \$50,000 was collected to erect a memorial statue in Arlington Cemetery to the battle-front nurses of the First World War. That statue was erected. The ladies who have been working upon the proposal to erect a memorial for those who are serving in this World War conceived the idea that it would be much more effective if this memorial should be in the form of a home in the District of Columbia which could be used as a headquarters for the service nurses. That, Mr. President, is the purpose of the bill.

As a part of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the Record a series of letters which have been addressed by various women to Mrs. Barnett Nover, who has been chosen as the chairman of the national committee to erect this memorial to the medical women of the armed forces.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I shall be happy to have my name included on your honorary committee to obtain a headquarters for the Army and Navy war nurses of the armed forces.

Best wishes for great success in this new venture.

Sincerely,

MARTHA E. KING
(Mrs. Ernest J. King).

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I would be delighted to be on the honorary committee for the nurses' club.

As I am at the United States Naval Hospital nearly every day I have many friends among the Navy nurses. They are a fine lot of women. I wish you all possible success in your venture.

Most cordially,

CATHERINE NIMITZ
(Mrs. Chester W. Nimitz).

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: It is a pleasing privilege to join the committee to assist in establishing a memorial dedicated to the Army and Navy nurses of World War No. 2.

These splendid women are caring for our soldiers in all parts of the world, sharing their hardships and dangers and in many cases giving their lives in the performance of their duties.

I am happy to accept.

Most sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. IRELAND
(Mrs. Merritt W. Ireland).

(General Ireland was the Surgeon General of the U. S. Army during the last World War.)

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I think it so wise to establish a home for these fine women instead of some commemorative monument

and feel assured such a choice will meet with universal approval.

With sincere wishes for success, believe me,
Very truly yours,

EDITH BOLLING WILSON
(Mrs. Woodrow Wilson).

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, July 5, 1944.

Mrs. BARNET NOVER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am writing you in the absence of General Kirk, who is in Europe.

I know how he feels about the establishment of a nurses' club here in Washington—that it would be much better to have some place of this sort for these splendid women who are on duty here than to wait until after the war and erect a monument in their honor. He also greatly appreciates the efforts that you have made in attempting to secure such a club.

With best wishes for the success of this venture, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE F. LULL,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Surgeon General.

THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE NAVY,
Washington, July 10, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: It has come to my attention that a move is being made to establish an officers' club for the medical women of the armed forces. I think this is a splendid move and I can assure you that this Department will be very glad to see it come about. As you know, our Navy nurses have never had a place in Washington where they could gather and have the opportunity of meeting the other women of the armed forces. This proposed club will be of great value to the Navy Nurse Corps during the war and in the years following.

May I express the hope that this club will come into being during these war years?

Sincerely yours,

ROSS T. MCINTYRE,
Vice Admiral, Marine Corps,
United States Navy.

JULY 13, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: The establishment of a clubhouse for the nurses of the armed forces such as you propose would indeed be a wonderful tribute to the women of the profession.

This form of honor bestowed on the nurses who are taking such an important part in this gigantic world conflict would be a deserving recognition of their courage and unselfish service. The generosity of our citizens in the form of a clubhouse would bring these women untold comfort and pleasure and convenience. In their own individual appreciation of all this they will experience a subconscious joy in the fact that it will bring the same comfort and pleasure to many nurses who may follow in their footsteps.

I am wishing for you all success and harmony in your undertaking; may it materialize in all that you now hope to accomplish.

Very sincerely yours,

SUE S. DAUSER,
Captain (N. C.) U. S. N.,
Superintendent, Navy Nurse Corps.

JULY 6, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. KIRK: Your suggestion for a memorial in the form of a clubhouse for women officers of the Medical Department is an excellent one. Certainly for the duration of the war such a building is most urgently needed and will be greatly appreciated by all who are eligible to use whatever accommodations it will afford.

There are over 40,000 nurses in the Army Nurse Corps, with approximately 2,500 Medical Department dietitians and physical therapists, and a small number of women doctors, all of whom will be delighted to know that this project has the approval of the Surgeon General and is being promulgated by a committee of women under your direction. With the difficulties encountered by the traveling public in securing hotel accommodations, many women officers of the Medical Department who pass through Washington for the first time have been unable to secure overnight accommodations which would enable them to see more of Washington en route to their post of duty. For these women the club will fill a great need. For the women who are stationed in and about Washington it will provide the club facilities enjoyed by most officers through the Army and Navy Club, which, due to the expansion, is too limited to allow for the extension of its courtesies to women officers.

As Superintendent of the Corps, I wish to express my own appreciation for the consideration that is being shown the members of the Army Nurse Corps, and I am sure I express the sentiment of every nurse officer in saying "Thank you and all others who have so generously given of their time and money in the furtherance of this project."

Very sincerely yours,

FLORENCE A. BLANCHFIELD,
Superintendent, Army Nurse Corps.

JULY 15, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I will be glad to have you use my name on your honorary committee for the proposed Army and Navy War Nurses' Club. I hope to see you during one of my brief moments in town during the summer.

Cordially,

JOSEPHINE FORRESTAL.

JULY 27, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am enclosing a brief statement for the Medical Women's Army and Navy Club.

I feel greatly honored to be on the honorary committee for Medical Women's Army and Navy Club, a memorial dedicated to the Army and Navy nurses of World War No. 2. I know of no group in the war service who so deservedly should have our support and gratitude as this heroic group of women. Their unselfish service should be an inspiration to the women of this country.

I send them my greetings and deepest admiration.

Mrs. GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

JULY 24, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am especially glad to serve on your honorary committee for the Medical Women's Army and Navy Club. It is a fitting memorial to the fine work done by the Army and Navy nurses of World War No. 2, and to the other women who are working so valiantly in the medical field for the Army and Navy.

May the club be very successful and may your good work be appreciated to the full.

Very sincerely yours,

MARGARET W. PATTERSON.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I shall be most happy to serve on the honorary committee for the Medical Women's Army and Navy Club.

No other group of women have proved more heroic or performed a greater service to our armed forces than the nurses of the Army and Navy, and I feel this memorial will be one way to perpetuate the glory of their services in the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

ELEANOR P. ARNOLD
(Mrs. Henry H. Arnold).

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am very happy to serve on the Honorary Committee for the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club, a memorial dedicated to the Army-Navy nurses of World War No. 2.

I wish for you every success in this fine undertaking.

Most sincerely,

LOUISE H. SOMERVELL
(Mrs. Brehon Somervell).

JULY 24, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: It is with pleasure that I serve on the Honorary Committee for the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club.

It is entirely fitting that these valiant women be honored by a tangible, lasting remembrance. I feel that their service to the Army and Navy and to humanity is a monument of great respect and admiration.

Cordially yours,

PATRICIA TYSON YOUNG
(Mrs. W. B. Young).

JULY 14, 1944.

MY DEAR MRS. NOVER: I have been advised that you are the chairman of a committee whose worth-while purpose is to provide a club for the splendid medical women in our armed forces when they are present in Washington.

Although the Marine Corps does not have its own medical department, this being accomplished by the Medical Department of the United States Navy, we are vitally interested in assuring these Navy nurses adequate recreational facilities.

As Commandant of the Marine Corps, I heartily endorse this excellent proposal and express my personal hope that it be activated at an early date and be maintained during and after the war.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. VANDEGRIFT.

AUGUST 14, 1944.

DEAR MRS. NOVER: I am very happy to serve on the Honorary Committee for the Medical Women, Army-Navy Club.

This memorial dedicated to the Army-Navy nurses of World War No. 2 is a wonderful tribute and I know will be a great success.

MAMIE D. EISENHOWER
(Mrs. Dwight D.).

Acceptance letters of blessing from Mrs. Henry L. Stimson, Mrs. Harlan Fiske Stone, and Mrs. Robert H. Jackson.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to approve what was said by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The bill is one which I think deserves the careful attention of the Senate and it should be approved and passed. It deals with a great cause, and as cosponsor I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4286. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California;

H. R. 4697. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological-station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080); and

H. R. 5232. An act to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 5041. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 5255. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER BEFORE INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS UNION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WAGNER before the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, on September 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT BEFORE OHIO REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him before the Ohio Republican State Convention on September 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER TO DECLARE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Too Much Power to Give to Any One Man, delivered by him on September 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS—LETTER FROM HON. JESSE JONES TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to himself by the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the subject of assistance extended to small business, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS—STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, at public hearings before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on September 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BENEFITS AND MUSTERING-OUT PAY UNDER G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD articles entitled "Veterans Must Ask for G. I. Benefits" and "Amount of Mustering-Out Pay Depends on Type of Service," published in the Washington Post, which appear in the Appendix.]

ATTACKS AGAINST THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Call a Halt," printed in the Providence Visitor, of Providence, R. I., for September 14, 1944, and an editorial entitled

"Racial Poison," by Marquis Childs, printed in the Washington Post for September 16, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S OPENING CAMPAIGN ADDRESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as all Members of the Senate know, I am a strong party man and a good Democrat. I differ with the Republicans in politics, but I like most of them, especially those here in the Senate. There are some other Republicans besides those in the Senate who sometimes say things that make me feel kindly toward them. I read in the opening campaign speech of Mr. Dewey at Philadelphia on September 7 several things which were very pleasing to me. I had hoped that some one of the Republican Senators would put that speech in the RECORD. I was waiting for that to be done. That is why I have delayed this long in making these remarks. I was just waiting for a Republican Senator to ask unanimous consent to have the Philadelphia speech of Mr. Dewey printed in the RECORD. I was not going to object to such a request, but I wanted to say then just what I intend to say now. I wanted to call attention to some of the statements made by Mr. Dewey. But no Republican Senator asked to have the speech printed in the RECORD. Congress is about to adjourn and I am taking the liberty of showing my appreciation of some things stated by Mr. Dewey just the same.

I jotted down at the time some of the things Governor Dewey said in that speech. I think of all the fine endorsements that any administration ever received in the history of the country the endorsement given by Mr. Dewey to the Roosevelt administration for its conduct of the war was one of the finest, best, and most generous endorsements I have ever read. Indeed, I am wondering how a man who so thoroughly endorsed President Roosevelt's conduct of the war would want to interfere with the conduct of the war by offering himself as a candidate against Mr. Roosevelt. It is a marvelous endorsement. No wonder no Republican Senator offered to put that speech in the RECORD. But I feel that it is not fair to the generous Mr. Dewey not to put it in the RECORD.

Certainly I want to put portions of it in the RECORD. It is not my intention to put it all in; but there are certain excerpts in which Mr. Dewey so powerfully, so unexpectedly, so vigorously, so earnestly, and so genuinely endorsed Mr. Roosevelt's conduct of the war that I feel that his generosity should be repaid by my putting in the RECORD certain of his statements, which I now read. I hold them up to Senators so that they can see the actual newspaper excerpts which I now propose to read. This is Mr. Dewey speaking, not the Senator from Tennessee:

For nearly 3 years our Nation has been engaged in a world war. Today our armed forces are winning victory after victory.

Remember this speech was delivered on September 7, and we are winning victory even faster now. I continue to read:

Total smashing victory is in sight. Germany and Japan shall be given the lessons of their lives—right in Berlin and Tokyo.

America—our America which loves peace so dearly—is proving once again that it can wage war mightily. * * * That it can crush any aggressor who threatens the freedom which we love even more than peace. The American people have risen to the challenge. The war is being won on the battle fronts.

I call especial attention to this; not only is it being won on the battle fronts, but listen to Mr. Dewey:

It is also being won in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine, and the home—

And the home.

Yes; we are proving that we can wage war.

I am quite sure my Democratic friends will agree with me when I say to the Republicans, what a wonderful endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt as Commander in Chief of the American forces. Did anyone ever hear a finer endorsement? I do not believe any Democrat has ever uttered a finer or more complete or more all-embracing endorsement of the conduct of the war than was uttered by Mr. Dewey in Philadelphia on September 7.

What an endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt and his Cabinet. What an endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt and his associates. What an endorsement of General Marshall, General MacArthur, General Arnold, General Eisenhower, General Clark, and General Patton, and all the other generals and leaders and all the boys engaged in the war. Mr. Dewey has certainly endorsed the conduct of the war as no other man has done.

I wish to commend Mr. Dewey for being honest and sincere in telling the American people how well the war has been conducted. Let me say that since his speech was delivered on September 7, we have made even greater strides, and I am expecting Mr. Dewey almost any night to utter another endorsement of the conduct of the war, and give his approval in a major speech, not a minor one. It seems he has major speeches and minor speeches.

I am expecting to hear Mr. Dewey again turn loose almost any time about the continued great leadership of his distinguished opponent, Mr. Roosevelt.

Not only does he in the excerpt from which I have read commend President Roosevelt's conduct of the war in foreign fields all over the world, but he goes beyond that, he goes far beyond that; he commends the conduct of the present administration in winning the war in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine, and the home. It is hardly conceivable that any man in America could deliver a finer encomium of the Roosevelt administration as it is operating either at home or abroad.

But these are not all the commendations the Republican candidate, Mr. Dewey, showered on Candidate Roosevelt in his opening speech. He evidently felt that the words "in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine, and the home" were not sufficiently broad.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I promised to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, but I am willing to yield to any Senator on the other side.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I always love to listen to the very distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. For the most part we can agree upon things that are coming before us in the Senate, but I wonder whether the Senator means to imply that the boys working on the farms, in the mines, in the factories, and the boys who are carrying on over in Europe and in the Southwest Pacific, are all new dealers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; probably very few are. I do not know how many are; I have not the slightest notion. I am now merely referring to the wonderful encomium the distinguished Republican candidate for President, Mr. Dewey, has delivered on the conduct of the war, and stating how much I as a Democrat appreciate his approval of the conduct of the war in all its operations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I gather that the Senator feels that in view of this wholehearted, enthusiastic endorsement, Mr. Dewey should vote for Mr. Roosevelt for President.

Mr. McKELLAR. He may do so before he is through, if he continues in the way he began. Listen for a moment. I repeat, I have not read all the commendations Candidate Dewey showered upon Candidate Roosevelt in his opening address. He evidently felt that the words "in the factory, the office, on the farm, in the mine, and the homes" were not sufficiently broad. He wanted to be more specific in his endorsement of the great work of this administration. I shall refer to what he said a little later in the same speech. The speech is not found in the RECORD. I have here the report of it in a Philadelphia newspaper just as Mr. Dewey delivered it and shall be glad to show Senators a copy of it.

Mr. Dewey wanted to be more specific, and a little later in his speech he made the endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt's domestic policies more pointed and more specific and even stronger when he said what I am about to read. I hold up the paper so that Senators can see it; I am taking no chances. I am reading from Mr. Dewey's language. I do not want anyone to misunderstand me. I want to quote exactly what he said. It is here in newspaper type. Every Senator can see it.

Mind you, the Democratic administration has already put certain domestic policies into force, and here Mr. Dewey names them and says:

Of course, we need security regulation. Of course, we need bank deposit insurance. Of course, we need price support for agriculture. Of course, the farmers of this country cannot be left to the hazards of a world price while they buy their goods on an American price. Of course, we need unemployment insurance and old age pensions and also relief whenever there are not enough jobs. Of course, the rights of labor to or-

ganize and bargain collectively are fundamental.

All those things have been put into law under the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, and here is a specific endorsement of many and perhaps of most of the great acts the President has put into force.

I am asking Republican Senators, all of whom are my friends, I believe, whether they can imagine anything stronger than the endorsement just read. It covers a very large portion of the Democratic legislation of the present administration. We have security regulation. We have bank deposit insurance. We have put through price support for agriculture. We have protected the farmers against high prices. We have brought about unemployment insurance and old age pensions and relief all along the line. The Governor, it is true, did not mention all we have done, but he gave his approval to all he mentioned.

Mr. President, if we have done all the things Governor Dewey commends, why in the world is he a candidate? That is a wonder to me. He says we have done everything well in the war, we have done everything well on the domestic front. He approves all the legislation we have passed. Well, I am just wondering about the necessity of his going to the trouble to run against the man who has put into force everything he declares to be good.

Governor Dewey endorses all of his opponent's foreign policies; he endorses all of his domestic policies, and his policies dealing with the homes, the factories, the farms, and the mines. Ah, Mr. President, if ever a man was telling the truth when he uttered those words of commendation of Mr. Roosevelt's war policies and his peace policies, his domestic policies, Mr. Dewey was telling the plain truth all along the line. I suppose he was giving utterance to his honest-to-God sentiments, and certainly I want to say that they have struck a very responsive chord in my breast. I am frank to tell Senators that I greatly enjoyed reading those excerpts.

Then Mr. Dewey, for a Republican, made one of the most remarkable admissions I have ever read. I wonder if there are any Senators present who actually remember the Hoover administration from 1929 to 1933, just prior to the Roosevelt administration. I will digress long enough to say that I know my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] remembers it, because I recall that he was in the Senate then. Let me see if there is any other Senator present who was in the Senate at that time. I think my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was in the Senate, too. That makes two Senators. I do not see any more Senators on the Republican side now who were in the Senate then, but on this side my friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was in the Senate from 1929 to 1933, as was my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I believe the four I have mentioned are the only Senators now present who were in the Senate at that time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. REED. I rise because in a committee session with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee within a few minutes before we came to the Senate floor, the Senator said he was going to make a speech, and then he assured me that in that speech he intended to praise the Republicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am praising them. I am praising the Senator's candidate to the skies. I think he has made a wonderful statement approving all Mr. Roosevelt's policies. I want not only Democratic Senators, but Republican Senators and everyone in the country, to know how thoroughly he praised policies and performances of the present administration in his first major speech.

Mr. REED. But I thought the Senator from Tennessee was going to give Senators on this side of the aisle some praise on their own account. I am very much more interested in praise of Republicans by the Senator from Tennessee than anything else just now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say how I feel about every Republican in the Senate. I like the Republicans here just as I like the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. REED. That is damning us with faint praise, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it is not faint praise. It is grand praise. I imagine some Democrats remember the Hoover administration, but I thought perhaps some Republicans had forgotten it—by accident, of course. Senators will remember that it was a pretty tough time.

Now after giving the Democratic administration all this praise, listen to what Mr. Dewey says. He makes excuses for the Democratic administration not having been even better. He praises the administration to the skies, and then he makes excuses for its having not been better. Listen to this. In my judgment, it is the most remarkable statement I have ever heard in a political speech, and it is an absolutely correct statement, and I endorse it. I think every Senator who was in the Senate at the time will endorse it. After telling how much the Democratic administration has accomplished, Mr. Dewey said:

When this administration—

Meaning the Roosevelt administration—

took office the depression was already over 3 years old.

Mr. President, just think what Roosevelt has accomplished with that handicap. Roosevelt had the handicap of a depression which was 3 years old, and he has overcome it, and has done all the things that Candidate Dewey said he has done. But that is not all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely I will yield.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator misses the point. The point is that in every previous depression the country always recovered within 5 years, merely through the normal processes of recovery which have occurred always in the

United States, but in this case, after its first 3 years, the depression, by reason of the methods applied by the New Deal, continued for another 8 years thereafter. That is the point. Perhaps the Senator missed that point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my good friend, the kindly, the generous, the smiling Senator from Ohio, did not happen to be in the Senate during that depression. He should remember that that was the depression of all time, the depression of all depressions, just as certified by the distinguished Republican candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Dewey. It was the greatest depression we have ever had. It took the present administration some little time to get rid of it, but this country has never been more prosperous in its history than it is today and has been for years and years before the war.

Mr. TAFT. It took a world war to get rid of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it did not take a world war to get rid of it. We had gotten rid of it long before that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That prosperity, that shot in the arm, has not been paid for.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is that?

Mr. WHERRY. That shot in the arm, or so-called prosperity, has not been paid for yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. WHERRY. We owed \$50,000,000,000 before we ever got into the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true. But we have gotten along before, and we are going to get along again.

Mr. President, I now want to call attention to another remarkable endorsement, and this is really more remarkable than any of them. I shall return to my notes for a minute so as to be accurate. Just think of a Republican candidate being so fair as to admit the 3-year depression handicap, after praising the Roosevelt administration as he praised it. Just think of his being fair enough, Senators, to say that Mr. Roosevelt had done all this splendid work, had had passed all these many bills, had brought peace and prosperity to the homes and the mines and the farms and the factories, and to the wage earners after having had to start out under a handicap of 3 years' depression under Mr. Hoover.

I want to tell Senators that, whatever else may be said about Mr. Dewey, he is a frank and truthful man when he talks about the splendid conduct of the Democratic Party and the Democratic administration under Mr. Roosevelt.

But he did not stop there. We would all have thought he would have stopped there, but he took no chances, he made no mistake about it. He wanted to make his endorsement complete. He had left out one feature, so he wanted to make his endorsement of the Democratic administration complete, and he sent his friend, Mr. Dulles of the cartel house of Cromwell, Sullivan & Co., or Sullivan, Cromwell & Co.—I do not know which it is—of New York City, to Washington to attend in his name the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and after Mr. Dulles,

acting for Mr. Dewey, had thoroughly gone into the foreign policies of President Roosevelt. Mr. Dewey announced that he endorsed them all, and that Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policies would be his foreign policies. That completed this wonderful, this magnificent, this generous, this truthful endorsement of President Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly to all Senators and to the public to read this remarkable speech by our friend, Mr. Dewey, which he made in the very opening of his campaign. It was not a minor speech. Oh, no. It was a major speech. It was the most major of major speeches, because it was his first speech. At the very beginning of his campaign he endorses the Roosevelt policies all along the line. He has endorsed the policies and acts of the Democratic administration all along the line, and I congratulate him on it. I commend him for it. I believe that if I had said that much about an opponent's well-doing, I should have said, "The war is not yet over. This man has done so well in his domestic policies, his foreign policies, and his war policies, and we have been winning so consistently all along the line, on hundreds of fronts all over the world, that I think I will just ask my supporters to let me withdraw and let my opponent head the Government until the war is over and the peace terms completed."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have finished, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will remain on his feet long enough for me to express my very deep personal disappointment. At 10 minutes to 12 the Senator, in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, where I sat on his right, leaned over and said to me, "I am going to leave the committee meeting. I intend to make a speech praising the Republicans." Here I am, following the Senator. I excused myself from the committee meeting and came into the Senate Chamber. I have been listening anxiously, wistfully, and hopefully for the promised praise of the Republicans. Surely the Senator from Tennessee is not going to take his seat and leave one of his best friends and most devoted followers in a condition of disappointment and disillusionment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I would not do that for the world. Let me say that I cannot wish for Republican Senators anything better, and I do not believe they could serve themselves and the country better than by taking to their hearts the wonderful endorsements by Mr. Dewey of the Democratic administration and its policies as then approved by Mr. Dewey. We will let the matter rest there.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator is thinking of voting for Mr. Dewey because of the likeness of his views to those of the Democratic candidate? I know many southern

Democrats who intend to vote for Mr. Dewey, and I am hoping that perhaps the Senator will do so. I should think the Senator would prefer a man elected for a first term rather than a man elected for a fourth term, to which the Senator has always been opposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Democratic candidate for President has not had as many terms as my friend from Tennessee has had. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. I am not complaining too much about terms. I may run for another.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself am running for a fourth term.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is an additional reason.

Mr. President, Mr. Dewey made a very excellent speech. There was only one thing in it to which I objected. Perhaps I ought not to mention it. I told the Senator from Kansas that I was going to praise the Republicans, and not criticize them. The only thing in the speech of the Republican candidate for President, Mr. Dewey, that bothered me was the statement which he made about getting rid of old men in office. I wonder just what steps he would take to get rid of elderly gentlemen, especially those in the Senate. I can speak with authority on this subject, because I am getting along in years.

Let us take one example. I refer to that grand, honorable, eloquent, and honest man, HIRAM JOHNSON, one of the finest men I have ever known in this body. I do not believe there is a more honest man in the world today. There is not a grander man anywhere than good HIRAM JOHNSON. I believe he is 81 years old. HIRAM JOHNSON ought to be working for the Government. It is an inspiration to work with an honest man like HIRAM JOHNSON. I rather resent the idea of getting rid of old men.

I am now looking at one of the finest and most honorable men I have ever known. For the moment I am not talking about the minority leader [Mr. WHITE]. I am talking about one of the best, noblest, and most efficient Members of either House of the Congress. He is one of the most efficient men ever to sit in either the Senate or the House. He was also governor of his State for a long time. I have lived at the same hotel with him for many years. He is one of the finest characters I have ever known. His name is ARTHUR CAPPER. My God! How could anyone who knew ARTHUR CAPPER and HIRAM JOHNSON ever think that we ought to get rid of old men in our Government?

A while ago the junior Senator from Kansas said something about my not paying him a compliment. Let me say that the junior Senator from Kansas comes within Mr. Dewey's definition of old men who ought to be eliminated so that the Government could be turned over to the hands of young men.

Mr. WILEY. In what connection was that phrase first used?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe in that idea. I serve on the same committee with the junior Senator from Kansas. He is an excellent Senator. He is worthy to represent the great State of Kansas; and I do not believe that he should be turned out because he is approaching the age which I myself have attained. I take off my hat to the Senator from Kansas, and I hope he will think that I have fulfilled my promise to the last word when I said that I would say something complimentary about him. Mr. Dewey ought not to want to get rid of him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry that I was detained from the Chamber and missed the opening remarks of the Senator. I am wondering what he is talking about. Is he criticizing President Roosevelt for his attack on the nine old men on the Supreme Court?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; he limited his criticism to the nine old men on the Supreme Court. Possibly he made a mistake in thus describing them. I believe he did. But when a man is against any and all old men having anything to do with our Government as Mr. Dewey says he is, because they are alleged to be feeble and decrepit, I do not agree with him at all. I did not agree with President Roosevelt when he mentioned the nine old men, if he ever did so; and I do not agree with Mr. Dewey on that subject, much as I admire him for the statements which he made in his speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the President never referred to the Supreme Court, in any communication or any word he ever uttered, as the nine old men. That designation was given to them by some distinguished and celebrated authors in the District of Columbia, who wrote a book on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember the facts, but I remember reading in the newspapers that he had said something about the nine old men. To that extent I believe he was mistaken if he said it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Government is to be turned into a kindergarten, does the Senator know of any man better qualified to head it than Mr. Dewey?

Mr. McKELLAR. After all the complimentary things I have said about Mr. Dewey, I dislike to criticize him. I do not know Mr. Dewey. I do not know whether he would be a good man to head a kindergarten government or not; but I believe that the Government which we have is the greatest government in the world, and I believe that the old men who participate in it are just as capable as many of the younger men, and more so than some of them.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska. I shall be glad

to yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, who apparently has asked me for verification of his statement regarding the age of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], to know that he is only 78 years old. He was born September 2, 1866. So that takes him out of the "old men" class. The Senator from Tennessee is talking about a young Senator when he talks about the senior Senator from California.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator for correcting me about that, and I ask that the reporters be certain to correct it. If there ever was a man on earth whom I admire, love, and respect for being one of the most honest men God ever created on this earth, it is HIRAM JOHNSON, of California. He and I came here at about the same time. We have been friends all our lives, and I pray God we may always be friends. I wish I were half as good a man as he is.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator said in his opening remarks, when I was not in the Chamber, that Governor Dewey's speech had not been endorsed by Republicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; I said it had not been placed in the RECORD at the request of Republican Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Let me call attention to the fact that I asked and obtained leave, by unanimous consent, to have it printed in the RECORD. It appears at pages A3988, A3989, and A3990 of the Appendix.

I may also say that I endorse everything the Governor said, and I have fought more New Deal measures than perhaps almost anyone else in Congress has done. So I do not think the main point raised by the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I myself fully agree with Governor Dewey's philosophy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from Ohio even agree with his philosophy regarding old age?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, absolutely. In Ohio we had an old-age law before Congress and the New Deal ever began to pass one.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the fact that the Governor's speech was printed in the RECORD. The reason why I happened to make the statement I did make was that it just happened—I believe it is the first time it ever did—that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the President pro tempore of the Senate, wrote me a note and asked me to serve in his place. The Vice President was unhappily away for a week or two at the time. It was at the very time when I served as Presiding Officer, on September 7, that I had cut out the very excerpts from the newspaper I have on my desk. I had an arrangement of them made; and when any Senator asked unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD, I was going to refer to these splendid encomiums of the Democratic administration. The request to have Governor Dewey's speech printed in the RECORD must have

been made at some time when I was not in the Chamber. I was here for several days after that, and I know that such unanimous consent was not obtained during that time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I simply wish to comment that the Senator from Tennessee is not usually so far behind the times.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir. But the Senator will forgive me, I am sure, because he knows that both he and I have been very busy these last few days.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say another word, Mr. President, either in the Senator's time or in my own.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I am through.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Tennessee has spoken in such laudatory terms of Mr. Dewey, and of particular Republican Senators on this side of the aisle, that I am completely disarmed. I gathered from what the Senator said concerning Mr. Dewey that he believes that usually when Mr. Dewey speaks, it is as a great, able, patriotic American, and that when he does not speak in those terms he is something substantially different. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not criticized Mr. Dewey at all except concerning what he said about old men, and that might be regarded as something of a personal criticism, and not in any other way. I tried to be very complimentary to Mr. Dewey, for I certainly admire his full, complete, ample, and perfect endorsement of the Democratic administration, and its policies and accomplishments, foreign and domestic.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Tennessee has said reminds me of an incident which occurred in the Senate a number of years ago, when I was a young man. Perhaps it is not inappropriate to tell of it on this occasion. I can remember very well that the then Senator from South Carolina, Benjamin Tillman, sat in a seat next to the aisle, I believe, where the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is now sitting, or in the seat to the rear. Across the aisle, on the Republican side, and I believe where the present Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] now sits, or where the senior Senator from Wisconsin sits, was the seat of Senator John C. Spooner, of Wisconsin. They were two great Senators. Senator Tillman was one of the rugged characters who has served in this body, a man of great force, a man of great industry, a man of character, a man of intense feelings. Senator Tillman and Senator Spooner were intimate friends, having a deep affection each for the other. But Senator Spooner used to enjoy prodding the then Senator from South Carolina this way, that way, and the other way, always exciting the Senator from South Carolina to seeming wrath. The face of the Senator from South Carolina, lined and florid, was a face of power, and bespoke the feelings of the man.

On one particular occasion Senator Spooner engaged in this torment of the Senator from South Carolina. Then, following the pattern, Senator Spooner

spoke in such kindly and complimentary terms of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senator from South Carolina was wholly mollified, and with a smile on his face he turned to the Republican side of the Chamber and to the President of the Senate, and said, "Mr. President, one of the things I have never been able to comprehend is how gentlemen on the other side"—meaning the Republican side—"could be so agreeable personally and so rascally politically."

I take it that is the feeling of the Senator from Tennessee toward us. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President. I have a very deep and abiding affection for all Senators on the other side of the aisle. I do not know that I have ever criticized one of them. If I did do so, I did it in the course of debate, which would have been proper. I hope I have never done so in such a manner as to hurt anyone's feelings. I would not do that for anything. I am like the late President Harding was, to this extent: I have found this body one of the most delightful bodies in which I have ever served. Of course, I have served in only two such bodies, but my service in this body has been a very great delight to me, and I really and truly like every Member of the Senate, both those on this side of the aisle and those on the other side. I have nothing but the highest admiration and esteem for all the Republican Senators, beginning with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and including the last Senator who has come to this Chamber.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has always been kind and gracious to me, and I appreciate that. I think I will say to him what I have said behind his back before now. I have said that if I understood anything of the history of Tennessee there have been four outstanding characters who have represented that State in public places. First of all was Andrew Jackson, one of the great figures produced in this country.

Then came Mr. Johnson. Those of us of Maine looked with not complete favor upon Mr. Johnson, for he supplanted Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, as Vice President of the United States. But Andrew Johnson was the second great public servant from the State of Tennessee. The third is Cordell Hull, now Secretary of State.

I have always had the opinion in late years that the fourth member of that group is the present senior Senator from Tennessee [KENNETH McKELLAR]; for in all the years which have passed since I have known anything about public life and public men, there has been no Member of the Senate of the United States who has served his State with more faithfulness and greater distinction, who has been more a Senator of the United States, than KENNETH McKELLAR.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator with all my heart.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, after the delightfully humorous remarks

of the very lovable Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I am afraid the Chamber will find the remarks which I am about to make of a very different order.

On Thursday last, September 14, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, in a trip across the Nation to the west coast in the interest of his candidacy for President, stopped and spent a large part of the day at Sheridan, Wyo. I read to the Senate an Associated Press dispatch from Sheridan, Wyo., as follows:

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey told reporters today that President Roosevelt's Executive order creating the Jackson Hole National Monument was "characteristic of the devilishness of the New Deal and its lack of respect for the rights and opinions of the people affected."

Dewey said he was informed that Wyoming people were "violently opposed" to the Executive order which set aside 220,610 acres of land in the Jackson Hole area as a national monument, thus removing it from local and State tax rolls. He said Congress had defeated legislation to accomplish the result which had been achieved by the Executive order. The State of Wyoming has brought suit to set aside the order.

I omit several paragraphs of the dispatch as they deal with land matters other than the Jackson Hole National Monument to which I particularly wish to address myself at this time.

When Governor Dewey says that the people of Wyoming were "violently opposed to the Executive order which set aside 220,610 acres in the Jackson Hole area as a national monument," he was expressing the views of the people with great moderation.

The following day, on September 15, 1944, a reply came from the administration—at least I presume that the Secretary of the Interior speaks for the Administration—and the reply is so misleading, so full of trickery, so far from the whole truth, and yet contains a smattering of truth and false assumption, as to bring forth the contempt of every decent-minded citizen. I quote from Mr. Ickes' statement of Friday, September 15, 1944:

When the late Calvin Coolidge was President, he persuaded Mr. Rockefeller to purchase land in the Jackson Hole area for an enlargement of our National Park system. When Mr. Dewey's political godfather, Mr. Hoover, succeeded President Coolidge he encouraged Mr. Rockefeller to continue to buy these lands. When this administration came in in 1933, Mr. Rockefeller had already purchased all of the lands that Presidents Coolidge and Hoover had persuaded him to buy. If Mr. Dewey in his beagle-like snuffing about for votes has any criticism to make of this national monument, it should be directed, not at this administration, but at those of the last known Republican Presidents, and Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who is not notable for his support of Democratic administrations.

I say to the United States Senate, Mr. President, that Presidents Coolidge and Hoover never in the years of their Presidencies had anything whatsoever to do with, or in any manner whatsoever considered the withdrawal of 220,610 acres of the Jackson Hole country for the creation of a national monument. It is true that during their terms of office bills to enlarge the Teton National Forest

were introduced in the Congress, but never succeeded in passage, and, Mr. President, such bills never will succeed in passage.

Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes of the time of the Senate very briefly to review this situation so that it can be a matter of record. What I am about to tell the Senate is all a matter of record in the hearings of the House Committee on Public Lands on House bill 2241, introduced by Representative FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument. Those hearings were held during May and June 1943.

In 1919 the first civilian superintendent of Yellowstone Park since 1886 was appointed. Previously the management and operation of the park had been in the hands of the United States Army. When it was decided that the operation of the Yellowstone Park should be turned over to the Department of the Interior, Horace M. Albright was appointed superintendent, and from that moment trouble developed. I do not know what Mr. Albright's politics is. It makes no difference. He is—or perhaps I should say that he was—first and foremost a bureaucrat, and, being superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, he, in typical bureaucratic manner, early sought to extend the area of his domain. He envisioned a greater Yellowstone by extending the east line farther east and moving the south line so as to include, not only the great Teton Range, with its beautiful lakes, but the great stock-grazing, wildlife, and hunting areas of the entire Jackson Hole, Buffalo Park, and the great Thoroughfare country—the whole a vast area of northwestern Wyoming.

This dream of bureaucrat Albright's—or, as he refers to it, his "ideal"—met with opposition from the very start; but, in the usual manner of bureaucrats, Albright was persistent and ever had before him the idea of this mighty national park empire. As superintendent of Yellowstone Park, he was in a position to entertain many distinguished visitors who might be of use in advancing his ideal. Senators, Representatives, Governors, wealthy men from the East, writers, princes and princesses, and countless others were well taken care of when they visited the Yellowstone. I may say that the advent of the automobile into Yellowstone Park took place a year or two prior to Albright's appointment as superintendent.

Bureaucrat Albright attained some success when in 1929 a bill was introduced in Congress by our late, beloved Senator Kendrick to create a Teton National Park. Senators know that no national park can be created or enlarged except by congressional action. The bill to create Teton National Park finally became law, and as a result the Teton range of mountains and four very beautiful lakes at their foot were included in this park, which had a total area of 91,000 acres. There had been considerable opposition to the creation of this park from various sources. One was the stockmen, particularly the sheepmen from the west, who had for many years grazed

their sheep on the western slope of the Teton Mountains. In order to meet this objection, the western line of this newly created Teton National Park was placed almost on the top ridge of the mountains so as to leave out that valuable grazing area to the west, so that it could be operated by the National Forest Service and the grazing of livestock continued.

At the time of the creation of this park, our able Senator, the late John B. Kendrick, who sponsored the bill, did so on the understanding that the creation of this park by the Congress would be the final answer to the whole situation of park extension in northwestern Wyoming. In spite of this, bureaucrat Albright continued to work.

There was, however, a difficult problem which he had to face in the realization of his bureaucratic "ideal," and that was some 50,000 acres of deeded land in the Jackson Hole, all in the vicinity of the newly created Teton National Park, some of it even adjoining it. Before this bureaucrat could proceed any further with his ideal, that 50,000 acres of deeded land had to be eliminated. How could this be done? It was a tough proposition; but with the ready cunning of a bureaucrat he thought he found a solution. He had read and heard of, as we all had read and heard of—and admired—the munificence of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. So Albright went to work.

Apparently the first recorded visit of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to the Yellowstone National Park was in 1924, and at that time he provided some funds for cleaning up some of the dead and down timber on the roadsides. In July 1926 Mr. Rockefeller, as a guest of bureaucrat Albright, again visited the Yellowstone, and apparently for the first time he went into the Jackson Hole country south of the Yellowstone. In his report Albright says that they spent the night at Jackson Lake Lodge, and "during the evening we saw moose in the swamps near Jackson Lake." I am interested in that visit, because I happened to be at Jackson Lake Lodge that night and met Albright and Mr. Rockefeller, and also saw the moose in the meadows. Little did I dream of what was evidently going on in Albright's mind at that time. However, the result of that trip must have been very gratifying to Albright, because Mr. Rockefeller shortly afterward agreed to purchase the 50,000 acres of deeded land with a view of presenting it to the Federal Government so as to clear the way for the next step of Horace Albright's dream or "ideal."

I wish to make it very clear at this point, Mr. President, that I am satisfied that Mr. Rockefeller's action was activated by the highest motives, and I, with a great majority of people in Wyoming, deeply regret that his name ever had to be brought into this matter.

During the winter that followed, bureaucrat Albright began to have some misgivings. At all costs he had to keep the idea of this proposed Rockefeller land purchase from the people of Wyoming.

On February 16, 1927, which was early in the year following the visit of Mr.

Rockefeller to Jackson Hole, bureaucrat Albright wrote to Mr. Rockefeller, and I quote from that letter:

Should you feel that this is a matter that you would like to proceed with, I am sure it can be handled with excellent results along the following lines:

1. Say nothing, at the present time, about the larger or ultimate plan of acquiring all of the private holdings in the Jackson Hole.

2. Confine all activities to acquisition of holdings west of the Snake River in that area colored on the map you had, and which I return herewith.

3. Buy in this area, through an agency or agencies, under a plan to organize a recreation and hunting club. If there were more grazing lands on the west side of the river, I would advocate operating as buyers for a land and cattle company, but obviously there is no room on that side for cattle. A cattle company to operate on the east side later would be an ideal agency.

That, Mr. President, I might say, would be an "ideal agency" for fooling the people of Wyoming.

4. Employ a firm of attorneys in Salt Lake City to coordinate buying operations and disburse funds. I have in mind the firm of Fabian & Clendenin, men of unimpeachable integrity and judgment.

Mr. President, evidently their integrity was not sufficiently unimpeachable to cause them any hesitancy about fooling the public.

I continue with Mr. Albright's letter:

They are sportsmen, very public spirited, and intensely interested in Yellowstone. Mr. Clendenin I have known from childhood. We were classmates in college, and closest chums. He and his partner would act in this matter on a very narrow margin of cost.

Mr. President, here was one of the wealthiest men in the country buying large areas of land through them. Why should the firm of attorneys operate at a very narrow margin of cost?

I could go to Salt Lake City as soon as possible and put them in possession of all necessary facts and papers. They could deal with my Jackson Hole operators, one of whom I would have met me in Salt Lake City.

Mr. President, I am wondering what the Superintendent of the Yellowstone Park was doing with Jackson Hole operators when he was in the pay of the United States Government as superintendent of the park. To continue the letter:

They could also coordinate the efforts of dude ranchers, like Burt and Stewart. I could be in constant and confidential touch with them and they could also communicate with your confidential agent in New York.

5. Through these attorneys—

That is, those of unimpeachable integrity—

acting for a "recreation and hunting club" or some other hypothetical organization if a better one can be found, the lands could be acquired for cash, but on a policy of getting a month's time to get word back and forth between interested parties.

6. As soon as possible, the National Park Service and General Land Office will plat on maps all of the other private holdings in the Jackson Hole. I have the list of holdings as of December 1923. There were then 402 owners of a little over 100,000 acres of land. The situation has not materially changed since then. That land, which included the west side of Snake, too, is worth on an earn-

ing basis, perhaps \$1,000,000, including value of improvements. I cannot say what it could be acquired for, but investigations of value can be quietly secured this coming summer.

No doubt, Mr. President, that would be quietly secured by the attorneys of unimpeachable integrity.

The whole letter is set out on pages 163 and 164 of the hearings to which I have already referred. In spite of the camouflage and deceit that was being practiced on the people of Wyoming, Albright's fake company, with the aid of said attorneys of unimpeachable integrity and his Jackson Hole operators, succeeded in purchasing 31,000 acres of land out of a possible 50,000 acres which he desired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wonder if my colleague would permit an interruption at this point.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator have any information with respect to the political position held at the time to which he refers, or shortly thereafter, by Mr. Harold P. Fabian, one of the two lawyers mentioned in the letter he has just read?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have not, off-hand, Mr. President. I do not know whether it is in the record or not. If the senior Senator from Wyoming has any information as to that, I should be glad to have him put it in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a spirit of sweet reasonableness, I think it should be called to the attention of all and sundry that Mr. Harold P. Fabian was a leading Republican of Utah, and, if my information is not incorrect, he was serving as Republican National Committee man from that State. It is rather significant, inasmuch as this whole matter has been presented now by the Republican candidate for the Presidency during his campaign tour, that not only was the lawyer who handled the purchases for Mr. Rockefeller a Republican and a leading official of that party, but Mr. Rockefeller himself was one of the principal contributors to the Republican Presidential campaign in 1940 and, I understand, is now contributing to the campaign of 1944 also.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I know nothing of any contributions by Mr. Rockefeller, or the connections of Mr. Fabian with the Republican Party. I feel that this matter is not a matter of politics. What I have to say is, I hope, beyond the scope of politics. The question is purely one of the manner in which land in Wyoming was acquired by the Federal Government.

Things began to get pretty hot out in that section of the country at this time. The citizens there realized that the purchase of this deeded land and turning it over to the Federal Government would remove it from the tax roll of Teton County, and the livestock men knew that, once this area was created a park, grazing of all livestock would be at an end. It was further realized that hunting the vast herd of elk, the greatest herd in the United States, which must be hunted to be kept within bounds, would be prohibited; that summer homes would be

eliminated; that all possible future irrigation works for raising of crops would be ended; and that countless bureaucratic restrictions would be placed on the entire area. In view of this opposition, the purchase of further lands stopped.

In January 1929 Horace Albright succeeded Stephen Mather as Director of National Parks. After August 1933 he was no longer with the National Park Service, and went into private business. That would seem to have been more or less the end of the picture. It will be seen that neither President Coolidge nor President Hoover had had anything to do with creating this national monument; and I now come to the portion of my statement which will show the Senate whose idea it was, and who actually created this national monument.

The situation was that in November 1942 John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had over 30,000 acres of land in the Jackson Hole on his hands, and it is not necessary for me to tell the Senate whose administration that was, nor is it necessary for me to tell who was Secretary of the Interior at that time, and who still is.

On November 27, 1942, Mr. Rockefeller wrote to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, and I read that letter to my colleagues:

Nearly 15 years ago I purchased some 30,000 acres in the Jackson Hole country on the earnest recommendation of the then Director of National Parks. This I did for two reasons: First, having in mind the winter feeding of great quantities of game which was being gradually exterminated by starvation; and, secondly, never for a moment doubting that the Federal Government would gladly accept the land as a gift for addition to its national park system and would forthwith take whatever steps were necessary to that end. During the years that have intervened there have been, as you know, numerous negotiations with Government representatives in regard to the matter. As you also know, all of these negotiations have come to naught. Over this period I have expended in connection with the property, which cost me \$1,000,000, half as much again for taxes, maintenance, handling, etc. Today it stands me in at a total cost of roughly, \$1,500,000.

In view of the uncertainty of the times, like everybody else, I am and have been for some time reducing my obligations and burdens insofar as I wisely can. In line with that policy I have definitely reached the conclusion, although most reluctantly, that I should make permanent disposition of this property before another year has passed. If the Federal Government is not interested in its acquisition, or being interested, is still unable to arrange to accept it on the general terms long discussed and with which you are familiar, it will be my thought to make some other disposition of it, or failing in that, to sell it in the market to any satisfactory buyers.

Because you have been desirous of having this property added to the national park system and have given so generously of your time and thought in an effort to bring that result about—

I should like to interject to remind Senators that this is a letter from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior:

Because you have been desirous of having this property added to the National Park System and have given so generously

of your time and thought in an effort to bring that result about, I would not for a moment think of proceeding to carry out the program above outlined without having first advised you of my decision. Having done that, I am confident that, being so familiar with the situation as you are, you will be the first to say that I have shown every consideration in the matter. Moreover, because you know so well how eager I have been to have this great area preserved for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the Nation under the wise control and operation of the National Park Service, with which it has been my pleasure to cooperate so closely in many of its national parks and for which I have long had such high admiration, you will realize better than most people with what regret I now face the possible abandonment of that dream.

This letter can be found on page 76 of the hearings to which I have already referred.

Now, Mr. President, we are going to find out who is responsible for the creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument. I particularly call to the attention of Senators that up to this time, and even in Mr. Rockefeller's letter, no mention is made of a national monument. Monuments are created by Executive order. As I have said, national parks or enlargements to existing national parks, can only be created by congressional action. Ickes was up against the real thing. Apparently he could only get the Rockefeller land by enlarging a national park—in this case the Teton National Park—which would take congressional action, and that was impossible, as Congress, representing the people, would never pass such a bill. So some bright mind thought of the Antiquities Act, an act for the preservation of American antiquities, and only by the greatest stretch of imagination could any part of the 221,600 acres in Jackson Hole be construed as coming within the scope of that act.

I can see bureaucrat Albright hurrying from New York, and I can see the conference when someone hit on the idea—"Make it a monument; sidetrack Congress, bypass Congress. We must get the Rockefeller land. We must relieve this man of a serious tax situation." And so on the morning of March 15, 1943, a little more than 3 months after the receipt of Rockefeller's letter by Ickes, a proclamation, signed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President, proclaimed 220,610 acres of land adjoining the Teton National Park a national monument. It was really an enlargement of Teton National Park, if you please, which can only be created by congressional action; but the proclamation signed by the President proclaiming that area a national monument was published in the Federal Register.

I hope I have made it clear to the Senate that the man who sponsored and promoted, approved, and sent to the President for his signature this proclamation creating the Jackson Hole National Monument was Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior in the Roosevelt Cabinet, a man who Mr. Dewey rightly says is at the top of the list for dismissal in January 1945.

LIBERALIZATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me so I may place before the Senate two bills for which I shall ask immediate consideration. The bills will not require debate. I think they can be speedily disposed of. They are bills recommended by the Veterans' Administration to cure certain defects in the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar No. 1123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2015), which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (j) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(j) No installments of such insurance shall be paid to the heirs or legal representatives as such of the insured or of any beneficiary, and in the event that no person within the permitted class survives to receive the insurance or any part thereof no payment of the unpaid installments shall be made, except that if the reserve of a contract of converted national service life insurance, together with dividends accumulated thereon, less any indebtedness under such contract, exceeds the aggregate amount paid to beneficiaries, the excess shall be paid to the estate of the insured unless the estate of the insured would escheat under the laws of his place of residence, in which event no payment shall be made."

Sec. 2. That portion of subsection (3) (A) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) (A) Any person in the active service who on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, becomes totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty and such disability continues without interruption for a period of 6 months or until death intervening prior to the end of such 6 months' period without having in force at time of incurrence of such disability at least \$5,000 insurance issued under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the commencement of such total disability, national service life insurance in an amount which together with any such insurance then in force shall aggregate \$5,000 and such gratuitous insurance shall continue in force without payment of premiums until 6 months after the insured ceases to be totally disabled or until 1 year after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, whichever is the earlier date."

SEC. 3. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (r) to read as follows:

"(r) In any case in which premiums are not waived under subsection (n) hereof solely because the insured died prior to the continuance of total disability for 6 months, and proof of such facts, satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is filed by the beneficiary with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after the enactment of this amendment, or 1 year after the insured's death, whichever is the later date, his insurance shall be deemed to be in force at the date of his death, and the unpaid premiums shall become a lien against the proceeds of his insurance: *Provided*, That if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, proof of such facts may be filed within 1 year after removal of such legal disability."

SEC. 4. Subsection (5) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (B) hereof died without filing application and within the time limited therefor, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsection (2) or (3), as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 5 years after the date of death of the insured and the relationship and dependency of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator: *And provided further*, That persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within 1 year after the removal of such disability."

SEC. 5. Section 602 (h) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract, less any indebtedness, with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

SEC. 6. Section 602 (h) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator, under regulations to be promulgated by him, may include a provision in the insurance contract authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect, in lieu of this mode of payment, a refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sum of the installments certain, including a last installment of such reduced amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract less any indebtedness with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary: *Provided further*, That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which such settle-

ment would result in payments of installments over a shorter period than 120 months, nor in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act."

SEC. 7. Subsection (n) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended as of October 8, 1940, by substituting a colon for the period at the end of the second proviso and inserting before the last sentence of said subsection the following as a third proviso: "*And provided further*, That in the event of death of the insured without filing application for waiver, the beneficiary, within 1 year after death of the insured or the enactment of this amendment, whichever be the later, or, if the beneficiary be insane or a minor, within 1 year after removal of such legal disability, may file application for waiver with evidence of the insured's right to waiver under the conditions of this section."

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, rather than to take the time of the Senate, I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the unanimous report on the bill from the Finance Committee. It fully explains the amendment proposed to be made by the bill.

There being no objection, the report (Rept. No. 1105) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2015) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The enactment of this legislation would authorize payment of meritorious claims which must now be denied under the provisions of existing law, and since many of the persons who would be benefited are in needy circumstances, the committee recommend early consideration of this bill. Its various provisions are explained in detail in the attached letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 15, 1944.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended" with the request that the same be introduced and considered for the enactment at the earliest practicable date.

Experience gained in administration of the act, and developments resulting from amendatory legislation enacted during the period of the war, demonstrate the desirability of further amendments.

Section 1 of the bill would amend subsection (j) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide that in any case in which the reserve of a contract of converted national service life insurance, together with dividends accumulated thereon, exceeds the aggregate amount paid in installments to any or all persons within the permitted class of beneficiaries, the difference between such amounts shall be paid to the estate of the insured unless the estate of the insured would escheat under the laws of his place of residence, in which case no payment would be made. Under the provisions of existing law no payments of national service life insurance in force at the date of the insured's death may be made in case the insured is not survived by any person within the permitted class of beneficiaries even though there are persons in being who are entitled to his estate under the provisions of his will or under the laws of descent and distribution of his

place of residence. In certain cases the designated beneficiary will predecease the insured after he has carried insurance over a considerable period of time and there will be no one within the permitted class of beneficiaries living at the time of the insured's death. In such cases, it is believed that the reserve of the converted policy, which represents the amount paid as premiums in excess of the amount required for the protection afforded, together with any accumulated dividends, should be paid to the estate of the insured except where the estate would escheat.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would amend subsection (3) (A) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, effective as of October 8, 1940. Under subsection (3) (A) as now enacted, one who became totally disabled subsequent to October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, as the result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty, which disability continued without interruption for 6 months or more, was granted \$5,000 gratuitous insurance under certain circumstances and premiums due thereon were waived until 6 months after termination of total disability or until April 20, 1943, whichever was the earlier date. If death occurred before total disability continued 6 full months, no insurance can be deemed to have been granted, or if the disabled person for some reason such as mental incompetency could not apply for waiver of premiums prior to April 20, 1943, his insurance protection ceased. The amendment proposed in section 2 of the bill would grant relief in cases in which death occurs within the required 6-month period and would extend the time for making application for continuance of waiver of premiums until 1 year after the date of enactment of the bill.

Section 3 of the bill would add a new subsection (r) to section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act to prevent lapse of insurance in a case in which an insured is not entitled to waiver of premiums on account of total disability because death occurred prior to the continuance of such total disability for 6 months. Under existing law, waiver cannot be granted unless a total disability continues for 6 months.

Section 4 of the bill proposes an amendment of subsection (5) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act to permit application for insurance payments under subsection (2) or (3) of section 602 (d) to be filed within 5 years after the date of death of the insured. Under the provisions of subsection (5) as now enacted claim must be filed within 1 year after the death of the insured or 1 year after July 11, 1942, whichever is the later date. The Veterans' Administration has been required to deny insurance benefits because application was not timely filed in cases in which the insured's death was not announced by the service departments until more than 1 year after death had occurred. The need of this amendment is apparent.

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill would amend section 602 (h) (1) and section 602 (h) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the election of a refund life income in lieu of the mode of payments now provided. Under the provisions of section 602 (h) (1) if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age at the time the contract matures the insurance is payable in 240 installments, and payments will terminate after such payments are completed even though the beneficiary may continue to live many years thereafter. Under the provisions of section 602 (h) (2) if the beneficiary is 30 years or more of age at the time of the insured's death, insurance is payable in 120 installments certain with such payments continuing throughout the remaining lifetime of the beneficiary. In case a widow having a minor child, who is entitled to payments as provided in section 602 (h) (2), dies after having received one

or more installments of insurance, payments under the contract will cease after payment of 120 installments has been completed even though the total amount of the installments paid or payable is less than the face value of the policy and even though the child is too young to be capable of self-support at the time payments expire. The proposed amendments will authorize the payment of the full face value of the insurance in every instance and will also insure an income throughout the lifetime of the first beneficiary under the policy. In most instances insurance payments would continue until the child is self-supporting.

The following tables show the number and amount of the monthly guaranteed installments purchased by \$1,000 on the basis of the American Experience Table of Mortality at 3 percent under a life annuity plan and the number and amount of the guaranteed installments for 120 months certain as provided in section 602 (h) (2) at the ages stated:

Refund life income

Age	Number of guaranteed installments	Amount of each installment	Sum of guaranteed installments
6.....	309	\$3.24	\$1,001.16
10.....	304	3.29	1,000.16
15.....	296	3.38	1,000.48
20.....	288	3.48	1,002.24
25.....	277	3.62	1,002.74
30.....	265	3.78	1,001.70
40.....	235	4.26	1,001.10
50.....	199	5.04	1,002.96
60.....	158	6.34	1,001.72
70.....	116	8.64	1,002.24

PAYMENTS FOR 120 MONTHS CERTAIN UNDER SECTION 602 (h) (2)

Age	Number of guaranteed installments	Amount of each installment	Sum of guaranteed installments
6.....	120	\$3.40	\$408.00
10.....	120	3.45	414.00
15.....	120	3.54	424.80
20.....	120	3.65	438.00
25.....	120	3.79	454.80
30.....	120	3.97	475.40
40.....	120	4.50	540.00
50.....	120	5.39	646.80
60.....	120	6.81	817.20
70.....	120	8.51	1,021.20

Section 7 of the bill would amend subsection 602 (n) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the beneficiary to make application for waiver of premiums in the event an insured dies after having been continuously disabled for 6 or more months without having made application for a waiver which could have been granted upon his application. It is provided that the Administrator shall not grant waiver of premiums becoming due more than 1 year prior to receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the same, except that in any case the Administrator finds that failure to make timely application was due to circumstances beyond the control of the insured, or of the beneficiary if the insured is dead, an application may be accepted at a later date. It is also provided that if the failure to submit evidence of the existence or continuance of total disability was due to circumstances beyond the control of the applicant, such evidence may be accepted at a later date.

Under existing laws waiver of premiums cannot be granted except upon application by the insured. In certain cases it appears that failure to make timely application was due to the mental incompetency of the insured and in case the insured died without filing application, waiver could not be granted on application made by the beneficiary. The proposed amendment would authorize application for waiver by the insured for a longer period than 1 year after the commencement of total disability and in

such cases, in the event of the insured's death, would authorize application for waiver of premiums to be made by the beneficiary.

Enactment of the provisions of the proposed bill would authorize payment of many meritorious claims which must now be denied under the provisions of existing law, and as many of the persons who will be benefited under the proposed bill are in needy circumstances the need of early consideration of the proposed legislation is apparent.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES, *Administrator*.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that the measure is amendatory of the present law, and remedial in character, and that it comes before the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Finance Committee?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Maine is entirely correct. Not only that, but it has been urgently pressed by General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration by reason of certain hardship situations which have arisen because many active men in the armed services have thought their Government insurance protected their beneficiaries and now have become somewhat disturbed. This bill is intended to remedy that situation.

Mr. WHITE. The other bill which the Senator from Georgia intends to ask to be taken up is in practically the same situation, that is, it comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Finance Committee, and the earnest urging of General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I hope both bills will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIMINATION OF HARDSHIPS AND INEQUALITIES UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now ask for the present consideration of Senate bill 2058, calendar No. 1122.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2058) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person granted national service life insurance under Public Law 97 and Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941, shall be

deemed to have continued such insurance in force by payment of premiums whether or not such premiums were or were not paid so long as he remains in active military service as a commissioned officer and not permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights: *Provided*, That any premiums due and unpaid at the death of such person whose insurance is deemed to have been in force under the provisions of this section shall constitute a lien against the proceeds of such insurance.

Sec. 2. Section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection (s) to read as follows:

"(s) Payment of insurance benefits shall not be denied in any case in which the applicant for insurance died prior to July 1, 1942, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that the failure to pay premiums or to effect deductions thereof as provided in section 602 (m) hereof, could in any way be attributed to the inadequacy of the Service Department's procedure for authorizing deductions of premiums from active service pay prior to that date, or to want of proper instructions as to the requirements of such procedure: *Provided*, That premiums due on such insurance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance unless otherwise adjusted."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the brief report of the Finance Committee to the Senate on this bill be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, so that the reasons for the bill may be clearly indicated.

There being no objection, the report (Rept. No. 1106), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2058) to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is sufficiently explained in the letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs incorporated herein and made a part of this report. In short, the proposed amendments are necessary to eliminate hardships and inequalities resulting from the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended to date:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 5, 1944.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended," with the request that the same be introduced and considered for enactment at the earliest practicable date.

The amendments included in the proposed draft are designed to supplement the proposed amendments contained in a draft of a bill forwarded to you by the Veterans' Administration under date of June 15, 1944, and should be considered in connection with the same.

Section 1 of the draft would presume premiums were paid on the \$10,000 insurance granted to aviation cadets and aviation students by Public Law 97 and Public Law 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941. These acts granted \$10,000 insurance at Government expense to aviation cadets and aviation students while undergoing training until commissioned. Until enactment of Public Law 658, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 8, 1942, persons so insured were not required to continue insurance after being commissioned. In many in-

stances, due to misunderstandings, such persons failed to continue such insurance by payment of the premiums after being commissioned and consequently had no insurance in force at the time of their deaths. Since enactment of Public Law 658 aviation students and aviation cadets are required to continue their insurance after being commissioned and while on duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights. The proposed amendment would provide insurance for those officers who failed to continue insurance granted them under Public Law 97 or Public Law 99. Seventy-seventh Congress, and who died prior to enactment of Public Law 658, Seventy-seventh Congress.

Section 2 of the draft would add a new subsection (s) to section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that payment of insurance benefits shall not be denied in any case in which the applicant for insurance died prior to July 1, 1942, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that the failure to pay premiums or to effect deductions thereof as provided in section 602 (m) hereof, could in any way be attributed to the inadequacy of the Service Department's procedure for authorizing deductions of premiums from active service pay prior to that date, or to want of proper instructions as to the requirements of such procedure, provided that premiums due on such insurance shall be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance unless otherwise adjusted.

There are many cases in which, for some reason or other, particularly in case of officers, premiums were not in fact deducted although the applicant for insurance clearly indicated his intention to pay premiums by means of having deductions made from his active-service pay. This was due to the inadequacies of the system of deductions of premiums from pay for active military service prior to July 1, 1942. These inadequacies have been eliminated since that date and section 2 of the draft will obviate the hardships resulting from the former system.

As heretofore stated, all of the proposed amendments have been shown by experience to be necessary to eliminate hardships and inequalities resulting from the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to date.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration has today addressed a letter to me in which is suggested an amendment to the bill, and I shall now offer that amendment from the floor. The amendment is at the end of the bill to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 3. Any liability under this amendatory act shall be chargeable to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from North Dakota for having yielded to me for this purpose.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed House Joint Resolution 268, providing for the reappointment of two members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, without reference to the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, which was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1569) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5125) to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

POSTPONEMENT OF COURT-MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST GENERAL SHORT AND ADMIRAL KIMMEL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, letters continue to come to me asking why Congress has postponed the court martial of General Short and Admiral Kimmel. Apparently recent discussions in the House have not clarified that situation or definitely established the fact that Congress has not postponed the court martial. Congress has no authority to order a court martial. That is the function of the Commander in Chief, or of his Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy. They alone could have ordered the court martial of General Short and Admiral Kimmel.

What the Congress did when the Commander in Chief did not order the court martial, and the statute of limitations would have run against an alleged offense, was only to extend the time in which the court martial might be had. We have no satisfactory answer as to why the President, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, has delayed ordering the court martial.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish.

I repeat that the Congress simply extended the life of the statute of limitations. Otherwise the time within which these officers could have been tried would have expired. The statute of limitations runs for 2 years, and there is some question as to whether or not the time has expired anyway. Of course, Congress could have investigated, but such procedure would have proved inadequate, as every lawyer knows. There was no way by which Admiral Kimmel and General Short could have been forced to testify. In my opinion there should have been a court martial long ago, not immediately after Pearl Harbor, but within the 2-year period, so that all the facts could have been brought out, but the Commander in Chief thought otherwise. That is his province. He has made the decision.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be through in a moment, and then I shall be very happy to yield.

The lives of 3,000 of our men were snuffed out. In my opinion the American people had a right to know the truth, and the guilty persons, no matter who they may be, should not escape. Someone failed America. That is very apparent. Three thousand lives were lost, and millions of dollars of property damage resulted. Someone is chargeable with neglect which put the war in the Pacific back at least 1 year. Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse. The Japs should have been taught the lesson there that they were taught at Midway.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Just now the Senator said that Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator intend to say, on the floor of the United States Senate, that our armed forces and our flyers should have attacked Japan as Japan attacked us? Is that his philosophy?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely off his base. He asks two or three questions in one. I stated that Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. And I say that it could have been in reverse if those responsible had been on the alert, if they had been on guard. The American people have a right to know who was to blame for their

not being on guard. If they had been on guard, the 400 planes which were there would have done the job which was done at Midway. They could have dealt with the Japanese carriers and other forces which the Japanese had in that area when they attacked Pearl Harbor. That is what we did at Midway. That is what I mean by saying that Pearl Harbor should have been in reverse.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to engage in a discussion—

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to have the Senator engage in a discussion.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to engage in a discussion of what might have been, because, such discussions are hopeless and confusing. I am about to say something which the Senator will resent very much at this particular moment. Such discussions are viciously partisan. I have said that, and I am not going to back up on it.

Mr. WILEY. I do not ask the Senator to back up. He is making his own bed, and he can lie in it. I have no objection to that. He can either mess it or muss it, as he chooses; but the people are entitled to know the facts.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, is he not?

Mr. WILEY. I am.

Mr. HATCH. If I may say so, he is a very able member of that committee.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I really think so. I never have any trouble with the Senator on the committee.

Mr. WILEY. I never have any trouble with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I find him very fair, and we get along very well together. However, when he takes the floor of the Senate he assumes a different attitude when he says that the Commander in Chief is responsible for postponing the court martial. Has the Senator forgotten our committee hearings when he says that no satisfactory answer has been given?

Mr. WILEY. No; I have not forgotten what took place there. In fact, I discussed the matter with an admiral of the Navy today. I remember that what was said in executive session was for executive session only.

Mr. HATCH. And the Senator still says, on the floor of the United States Senate, that no satisfactory reason was given?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Let the Senator's conscience be his guide.

Mr. WILEY. I trust the Senator also has a conscience to guide him. I am very happy to have one.

Mr. President, I realize that we are in a political campaign; but I realize, too, that every time a Senator on this side of the aisle rises to make a statement, some Senator on the other side takes it as a sort of personal affront, as if we

were trying to do something in the campaign that we should not do.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. I have allowed the Senator to interrupt. I have the floor, at least for the time being.

Mr. President, all America has been waiting for the answer. After the discussion in the House, and after a certain list of questions was submitted, which implied that the fault for Pearl Harbor was in high places and not with Admiral Kimmel or General Short, the people of America should have the answer. They should have the facts. It seems to me that the time has long since passed when the excuse can be made that witnesses from the four corners of the earth could not be summoned to testify in a court martial. That excuse does not make sense now. The people want to know why those at Pearl Harbor who had the obligation of protecting the lives and property of Americans, and the future of America were not on the alert and on guard. History shows that America was warned months before. The Secretary of State was warned that the Japanese were ready to strike. That is the only point which I make in this connection.

Mr. HATCH. The point I make—

Mr. WILEY. I make these remarks at this time because my constituents are writing to me. They have read statements in the newspapers implying that Congress has delayed this court martial, and that Congress does not want a court martial. My explanation is that Congress has had nothing to do with the deferment and delay. In the first place, it has no jurisdiction to order a court martial or if the President order one, to delay it. However, Congress did extend the time by extending the life of the statute of limitations, hoping that the time would come, in the judgment of the Commander in Chief, when the truth would be made known to the people of the country.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think the Senator has fully covered his own explanation.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. He has made it perfectly plain that he is talking to his constituents in Wisconsin, which he has a perfect right to do.

Mr. WILEY. There are no exceptions to that, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. Of course there are no exceptions to the Senator's right to do so.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator; I am glad he corrected himself.

Mr. HATCH. But Congress did have a responsibility, and Congress exercised its responsibility. The Senator's committee and mine sat and listened to very confidential and very secret information from both the Army and the Navy, and we—the Senator and I—decided—

Mr. WILEY. What did we decide?

Mr. HATCH. Republicans and Democrats alike—

Mr. WILEY. What did we decide?

Mr. HATCH. We decided that it would not be wise to hold a court martial

at that time; and because we did not think it was wise. I did not hear the Senator's voice raised in challenge to that decision at all.

Mr. WILEY. I deny that statement. We had no jurisdiction to decide whether there would be a court martial or not, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator may deny his jurisdiction, but I accept my full responsibility.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is a difference between jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. HATCH. Very well; the Senator may say so if he wishes to.

Mr. WILEY. Does not the Senator agree that there is a difference?

Mr. HATCH. I say to the Senator that he and I sat in the committee and heard the story.

Mr. WILEY. Whose duty was it to order a court martial?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator may lay it on the President if he wishes to do so.

Mr. WILEY. The statute defines that. I am laying nothing on the President. He, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy have the power to order the court martial. The Congress does not have that power. That is the law.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I seek to make no point of this controversy, except I happen to know what transpired in our committee, and I know that not a voice, either a Republican or a Democratic, was raised. I rather gloried in that. I liked the nonpartisan approach we made to that question. We extended the statute of limitations, because we did not think it would be wise, we did not think it would be in keeping with the war effort, to have the court martial held at that time. We thought the first job was to win the war, and that later if any responsibility was to be fixed, we could fix it.

But, Mr. President, now there seems to be a different attitude; the present attitude in the minds of some persons is that the first job is, not to win the war, but to win the election.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it can be inferred from the statement just made by the distinguished Senator that, first, we—the Congress—had jurisdiction to determine when a court martial should be had, and that we determined that question. That is absolutely incorrect. We had no such jurisdiction. We, in committee, discussed the period the statute of limitations should be extended and we listened to explanations of Navy and Army heads why it would be difficult to hold a court martial.

The only issue was whether we would extend the statute. The argument was made in the committee and on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] that the statute had run, that we could no longer even extend it.

But I agree with the distinguished Senator that in committee we did hear the testimony of admirals and generals giving reasons why they thought the President did not order the court martial. But the only issue that committee had to de-

termine was whether we should vote a 6 months' or 12 months' extension of the statute of limitations. That is what I want the people of this country to have clearly in mind. I do not want the people of the country to believe, as certain newspapers and magazines have inferred, that the Congress of the United States has deferred this court martial. We did nothing of the kind. We had no jurisdiction or authority to defer the court martial. All we did was to extend the time, so that the statute of limitations would not run against these officers, so that they could be tried when and if the higher-ups determined that a court martial should be had.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I deem it my duty to say a few words on this matter, in order that the action of the Judiciary Committee may not be misinterpreted because of what has been said.

The resolution extending the time was presented in the Senate by me, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. After it went there, the question of time became involved. The question was as to how long an extension should be made, whether it should be 3 months, 6 months, a year, or any other period.

I believe it cannot be said that the Committee on the Judiciary did as a matter of fact, pass on the issue whether the court martial should have been held prior to that time or should not be held during that particular period of time, because that matter was not germane to the compromise measure which finally was reported from the committee. As a matter of fact, the resolution speaks for itself when it says that, in the opinion of the Senate, the Army and Navy should forthwith proceed by inquiry into the facts, and should ascertain the facts, and should then proceed as the facts might justify. I can find nothing in the record of the committee or in my own conscience which will show that the committee or the Congress has been responsible for or has sanctioned the delay of the court martial of anyone in connection with the proceedings and the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. I do not think it is fair to the Judiciary Committee to intimate now upon the floor of the Senate that the Committee on the Judiciary has said to the President or to anyone else that the court-martial proceedings should not have proceeded.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. The country should know that, after all, under the Articles of War and the law which binds the Army and the Navy, court-martial proceedings are their duty, and their duty alone, and that they should not hide behind the action of the Congress.

Mr. President, let us review some of the facts in relation to the Pearl Harbor

incident in respect to what happened in the Congress. I shall not take the time of the Senate to say anything about what are the actual facts at Pearl Harbor. I do not want to make this matter political. I do not want it to become a political issue, because I believe that for the people of America what actually happened at Pearl Harbor is over and above politics, and that the time will come when the people of America will know exactly what happened and, if there is any blame, upon whom that blame should fall.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to say a few words, and then I shall yield the floor.

In the United States, the statute of limitations for courts martial was 2 years. There was an investigation. The period of 2 years elapsed, and no court martial of which I have any knowledge was ever started within that period. On the last day of the 2-year period the Congress, sensing its duty, extended the statute of limitations. There are in this body certain Senators, some of whom are lawyers, who will doubt the validity of that extension of the statute of limitations. A very serious legal problem is involved, although I personally hope it will never reach a court. It is whether the President of the United States, being out of the country, signed that extension statute within the 2-year period. There are in this body Senators who are lawyers who would say that because the President did not sign it within that period, the statutory period ran, and that therefore no proceeding can now be had under that statute. I am not one of the lawyers who share that view, because I think the Congress of the United States intended to enact that law within the statutory 2-year period, and that a court should hold that the extension is a good extension of the period.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate and to the people of America that something else happened on the 7th of June 1944. On that date the Congress provided for another extension of 6 months within which the courts martial might be held so that the time now expires on the 7th of next December. I remember rising in the Senate at the close of the day's session on the 7th of June 1944, realizing my responsibility as a legislator, and wishing to see to it that no step or act be taken which would prohibit the bill extending the time from being signed on the 7th day of June 1944, providing that the last 6-month period would be a valid extension of time. I rose and obtained unanimous consent that the Vice President, our presiding officer, might sign the bill, and that it would go to the White House on that particular day, and that there would be no legal question involved as to the signing of the bill on the last day of the session. But notwithstanding the care which was taken by the Senate, the President of the United States saw fit not to sign the bill within the period, and he allowed it to go over for quite a number of days.

Mr. President, I think the people of the United States should know of that fact. If the matter ever reaches the highest court of our land, the responsibility for the time not being extended ought to be upon the doorstep of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, because he alone was responsible for not signing the bill and making it law on the day it was passed by the Senate.

I shall not go into the facts as to what happened at Pearl Harbor. I shall go into the matter of the extension of time, and the question of whether the Senate, and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, extended the time because they believed that the courts martial should not be held. I, for one, say to Senators and to the world, Mr. President, that I have no facts in my mind which brought me to a conclusion that the court martial in any particular case with regard to what happened at Pearl Harbor should not have been held. I know, however, were I not transgressing upon the time of the Senator who has yielded to me, that I could present many facts which I believe would convince every Senator who would impartially weigh the facts that the courts martial should have proceeded.

In arriving at that conclusion I have taken into consideration the words of the Commander in Chief, as well as the words of the Secretary of the Navy, when Admiral Kimmel and General Short were retired that court-martial proceedings should be held. I think the country is entitled to know if there are any other persons who were negligent, or who in any degree contributed to what took place at Pearl Harbor. I hope the time may soon come when such information may be revealed. I for one will not do anything which, in my opinion, may harm or in any way interfere with the war effort, because I think the greatest task we have confronting us is to win the war in order that we may achieve victory and return our men to their homes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I assert, Mr. President, that the holding of a court martial with regard to the occurrences at Pearl Harbor would not in the slightest degree interfere with the war effort. So far as bringing men back to this country to testify is concerned—and I have gone into those facts—I believe that the greater part of the testimony could be given here in the Capital.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to speak for only a moment, if the Senator from New Mexico will pardon me. I wish to point out to the Senator from Michigan one fact which I think he could and properly should mention in connection with the action of the Judiciary Committee.

Those of us who were not members of the subcommittee received a report from the members of the subcommittee who had investigated the situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. We were advised that one of the great branches of the service had conducted no investigation whatever into the facts as to what happened at Pearl Harbor. That was why I personally penciled out and handed to a member of the subcommittee the amendment, adopted by the Congress, which called upon the services forthwith to proceed with their investigation in order that we might be given the facts. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I thank the Senator from Connecticut for calling that matter to my attention, because I think it should be made a part of the RECORD. What he has stated is exactly what happened.

Mr. President, I feel restrained in mentioning what happened in the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I was a member of the full committee and of the subcommittee. Because it was in executive session, I feel restrained in giving my version at this particular time of what took place in the committee. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut has not revealed any secret, because the matter was of a procedural nature.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if I have the floor I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have only a word to say. I merely wish to express my appreciation of the very good work which was done in the Committee on the Judiciary by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and also by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. And by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. There was no difference of opinion among the members of the committee. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] introduced the resolution to which reference has been made. He sat in the committee with me and others, and listened to the testimony of representatives of the Army and the Navy. We reached a perfectly unanimous conclusion. I say to the Senator from Michigan that I never worked with a more cooperative man than he was on that occasion. There was no difference of opinion between us. The political discussions which have been taking place back and forth did not then occur because we were convinced—perhaps I should not say “we,” but should say merely that I was convinced—after listening to the testimony that no good purpose could be served by insisting upon an immediate trial of Messrs. Kimmel and Short.

Mr. President, I wish also to say something in their favor. The delay and postponement of their trials has worked a very great hardship upon them. When the trials are held perhaps they will come forth with proof and evidence showing that no responsibility existed upon their part. I hope that they can produce such evidence. I know neither man, but I certainly hope that those men will be able to show, and that the evidence will disclose that there was nothing wrong in what they did and that no culpable negli-

gence existed on their part. I much prefer always to say a good word in behalf of a fellow man than to condemn him without affording him the right of a hearing and the opportunity to produce evidence. But, Mr. President, we hear condemnation on the floor of the United States Senate today.

I am perfectly willing to accord to Admiral Kimmel and General Short every reasonable presumption of innocence, and I pray and hope that that presumption may be sustained. But Senators on the other side of the Chamber are not willing to accord such courtesy to the President of the United States. They are willing to stand on the floor of the United States Senate and without hearing, without testimony, without evidence, find him guilty and send out word to the people of America and to the world that the President was responsible for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, that is an attitude I condemn. Certainly I am sure that Mr. Roosevelt has made mistakes; I am quite sure he has made many of them. I am quite certain that the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has made many mistakes; but I should like to see the man in this Chamber who has not made mistakes.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I think I have been most generous in yielding my time, but I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether I interrupted the Senator from New Mexico before he had concluded his statement.

Mr. HATCH. I had not concluded, but I do not think it is material that I conclude. My thought is, as it was in the committee, that these things ought to be determined upon a judicial basis far and aside from partisan political considerations, and I hope that may be done.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I rise because I also was a member of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which considered the extension of the period of limitation for the courts martial in the cases of General Short and Admiral Kimmel.

I think it ought to be made clear that there are two questions involved. There is a question of judgment and there is a question of law. With respect to the question of law, that is to say the technicality as to whether or not the extension of the statute of limitations was made within the proper time, that, it seems to me, is a matter not of pressing importance.

Concerning the matter of judgment, however, as to when and how the courts martial in these two cases should take place, that being solely a question of judgment, we ought to take into consideration the facts which existed at the time. Hindsight always is much better than foresight. It is particularly easy in the midst of a campaign for the Presidency for those who are so minded to seek to create the impression in the minds of the people of the country that some great wrong was committed by the Commander in Chief. Members rise upon the floor of both the House and the

Senate to discuss this matter and to give out inferences from which the people may draw a conclusion that delay in the courts martial was for the purpose of concealing important facts. I have in mind one gentleman who made such a statement, and, after having made the statement, he qualified it all by the clear declaration that he himself had no knowledge of the facts, but was merely talking upon information and belief.

Mr. President, the disaster at Pearl Harbor took place upon the 7th of December 1941. We were suddenly plunged into this greatest and most appalling of all global wars. A substantial part of our Navy was destroyed. We did not know what the Japanese Navy was capable of doing. Rumors were spreading up and down the Pacific coast that Japanese submarines were off the coast. The people of California and of Washington and Oregon were expressing fear lest their coast be attacked. I remember well that the distinguished late beloved minority leader, Senator McNary, of Oregon, was one of those who came before the Appropriations Committee in an effort to secure special appropriations to protect the forests of Oregon and Washington against possible disaster by reason of enemy attacks. It is easy to forget these facts.

It was a matter of judgment whether or not in such circumstances we should run the risk of exhibiting to our enemies the condition to which our naval strength had been reduced from the point of view of the Navy. If the courts martial had been held at that time we would have been spreading abroad to all the world knowledge of our weakness and we would have invited the very attack upon our coast which the residents of those States were fearful might come. It was a matter of judgment that in the circumstances then existing it was not a wise thing to bring those officers to trial. It was not a question solely of the difficulty of calling witnesses. It was also a question of calling the members of the court, because it would have been necessary to have tried General Short by a court martial, I understand, composed of general officers. It would have been necessary to try Admiral Kimmel by a court composed of officers of the same grade, unless I am very much mistaken. In other words, there was the danger that officers of the Army and of the Navy, whose time and attention and energy might best be devoted to laying plans to repel the enemy and preparing the Army and the Navy for carrying on that work, would have to sit down and hold a court martial of these two officers.

Mr. President, it is not without significance that there was no clamor in the public press or upon the floor of either House of Congress to proceed with these courts martial until the political campaign began. The extension was granted at the expiration of the first 2 years. Certainly it was done at the last moment, but the whole country, the Army and the Navy, and I imagine also the Commander in Chief, were very much concerned about other matters at that time.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to add just another word. In the conduct of a war

of this kind, a total war, we know that it is fought not only upon the battle fronts by the Army and the Navy, it is also fought upon the home front, and he who can break down the morale of the enemy upon the home front is serving a great purpose in winning victory. Any American citizen, any British citizen, any citizen of any of the United Nations who can contribute to destroying the confidence of the people of Germany in their government is serving the cause of the United Nations. Any citizen of America, or of Britain, or of any of the United Nations who can contribute to breaking down the confidence of the people of Japan in their government, is serving a great purpose in support of our war effort.

Mr. President, can it be said that those citizens of America who spend their time going up and down the country attempting to destroy the confidence of the people of America in their leadership are serving the cause of America in this war? For my part, Mr. President, I believe that such efforts to undermine our confidence in our leadership are not serving the interests of the war effort, particularly when we can look at the record which has been achieved under the leadership of the Army and the Navy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED
JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL
PRIMARY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I very much regret the necessity in this critical period to take the time of this body in answering an unjustified and unwarranted attack made by my colleague for reasons that could be described in no other manner than that of a purely political nature.

I might say at this point that at the time my colleague was speaking, I served notice that I would promptly answer what he said. I then gave notice last Friday that I would speak yesterday, and yesterday that I would today, and I am now speaking pursuant to that notice.

On Tuesday, September 12, my colleague from North Dakota attempted to blow up into an important incident a conversation that took place 1 year ago in this city. By the time he had finished his own interpretation of the statements contained in some affidavits made more than 6 months after the occasion referred to, he came out with a blast that a disabled veteran of foreign wars had been offered the sum of \$110,000 to enter the senatorial Republican primary in the State of North Dakota as a candidate for the United States Senate in June of 1944.

I feel a personal obligation to answer this unwarranted attack. His analysis, consisting of distortions and cunning innuendoes was built upon a conversation like those which have taken place for scores of years past in our history in every other part of this country, namely a free and informal discussion of politics, national issues, and candidates.

My colleague chose to attribute the alleged offensive conduct to one of my friends, who is not at all unknown to the Members of this body, Mr. Joseph B. Keenan, who is not unknown, especially to those who have served here for a long period of time.

I wish to relate as briefly as possible the facts as I recall them and describe to the Senate what happened, that the Members thereof may form their own judgment.

On the 14th of September 1943, following an old custom in our family, I invited my wife and children to dine with me on the occasion of the birthday of one of my daughters at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. Entirely by chance, Mr. Joseph B. Keenan, formerly the Assistant to the Attorney General, came by my table, and I invited him to sit down and visit with my family. After dinner, I requested him to meet some of my friends from North Dakota, some disabled veterans of the last war. These men came to Washington to confer on certain measures that I had introduced for the benefit of members of their organization. They had complained to me that their interests had been neglected and were kind enough to say that they felt I had shown interest in their needs and recognized the value of their services so often forgotten as time passes by, and they were grateful for my efforts. I had invited them to dinner as a group, unmindful of our family gathering set for that same evening, and I went over to see them at the Hamilton Hotel, where they were stopping, for the purpose of discussing their needs and their views, and renewing my acquaintance with many of them.

Knowing that Mr. Keenan had served in the last war overseas, that he had enlisted in the Army as a private and had earned his promotion as an officer and had received favorable comment from General Pershing and the French Government for his war services, I felt he would be interested in meeting this group of men. I told him nothing more about them other than that they were disabled war veterans from my State. As it happened, no politics of any kind was discussed between us on our way in the cab from one hotel to the other. He came with me without any thought, to say nothing of a plan, to discuss or consider any political matters of any kind. Of course, I need not add that under such circumstances no one by the wildest stretch of imagination could conjure up any plan to bring about any political coup of any kind, and the thought that under such circumstances that Mr. Keenan, who had not even planned to meet me would provide himself with a sum of money running into thousands of dollars for such a meeting would appear to be so illogical or unreasonable as to

deserve no further comment. Of these facts, there can be no doubt, and they are true.

When we got to the hotel some of the men were scattered and were undoubtedly conducting themselves as any other veterans in something of the nature of a holiday away from home. Eight or nine of us were gathered in a single room in this hotel. When I came in I introduced my friend as Mr. Keenan. I am sure that he did not know the name of a single individual he was to meet nor did he know anything about them other than they were from North Dakota and were disabled war veterans.

We discussed matters concerned with these resolutions. They were profuse in their appreciation of my attention and they brought up the subject matter that they had received no such consideration from my colleague.

During the conversation that followed, which was entirely informal and participated in by almost everyone present—sometimes the men speaking in groups and sometimes listening to one person—the gathering was reminiscent of many that happened throughout this country which we might call the "hot stove" league or "cracker-barrel" league. I knew some of these men quite well and others incidentally. They did not apparently know Mr. Keenan and, of course, he did not know them.

I shall later describe somewhat more in detail the matters discussed, but because of this blown-up episode as presented by my colleague, I shall refer to the basis of his complaint.

The question of politics arose—what was being done for the veterans, when the war would be over, what the losses would be, what the reaction of the people would be, and how the soldiers would feel when they came home.

You may rest assured, Mr. President, that this subject matter was uppermost in the minds of these men. They had borne the suffering and hardship of the battlefields and carried the mark with them of the conflict. Neither myself nor my colleague had ever encountered the hardships they suffered. They knew the cruelties and hardships of war. It had been indelibly impressed upon their minds and they had known the indifference of the people at home when they were mustered out of service and left to contrive and to earn a living by their own efforts in a dislocated world.

We from North Dakota discussed the likely candidates for office. The question came up as to whether or not Lynn Stambaugh would become a candidate. I have not seen Mr. Stambaugh or at least have not conversed with him for many years, but I have considerable respect for him as a man although his political views, as expressed, have not been mine.

Some of the men spoke up and said they did not think that he would become a candidate. I talked to various members of the group, suggesting the possibility that one of their number might become a candidate for the United States Senate. For greatly as I respect the members of this body, Mr. President, I am satisfied that there are hundreds

and even thousands of good men and women in my State that could faithfully and efficiently represent North Dakota in this body. No one has a patent on a position here. No one, including Senator Nye, I hope, considers himself an indispensable man. There was a good deal of criticism from these men about the indifference of Senator Nye to their problems and his failure to do much of anything for the citizens of his State during his long tenure of office in this body.

Mr. President, candor requires me to state directly that they were the ones who complained of Senator Nye and brought up the subject matter of a candidate running to represent the veterans' views. It is well known that I have found myself unable to support Senator Nye or to agree with him on the value of his record to the citizens of our State.

I suggested to Mr. Williams, who is an employee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., that he might become a candidate to represent the views of this organization and his members, but he said that he had a job which paid him \$7,200 per year and he did not want to leave it. I talked to Mr. DeWitt, who although he was not prominent generally in North Dakota, was a recipient of the Purple Heart and of a well-known family in his State, that he might become a candidate. The field, Mr. President, even in that small group was a very wide and open one. Mr. DeWitt replied that he, too, had a job which he would risk in running for office and that he realized that for any type of campaign, some funds would have to be raised. Mr. President, I was the one who suggested and stated that I believed a fund as high as \$10,000 could be raised in North Dakota to support a worth-while candidate. I initiated that conversation—not Mr. Keenan. And I might state in passing that in North Dakota I raised \$11,000—mostly in small and insignificant amounts among the people of my own State—in this last campaign. Of course, I make no apology for this nor do I apologize for stating that a similar sum could be raised for the necessary expenses to make known to the people of North Dakota the views of the veterans of wars.

Mr. Keenan was asked by me what he thought were the chances for a veteran—particularly a disabled one who wore the honored Purple Heart, in seeking office in this body. Mr. Keenan replied generally that he felt the time had come in this country where the men who bore the brunt of battle and come home with the wounds and scars not alone should be, but would be, heard of and listened to since twice in one generation our men had been sent overseas, away from their farms and their shops and their ordinary peaceful way of life. He talked a good deal on this subject and he said that regardless of what the views were of any State in the Union, he did not see how their appeal would fail to register in the families and households of North Dakota and every other State of the Union because he said that there was hardly a family in this country that did not have a father, son, brother, or

nephew, or a cousin, or son-in-law in the Army, or Navy, or Air Corps. He said that when this had been dramatically brought to the very hearth and hearthstones of every American family, the subject matter would be no longer academic. That every mother and father would know that what went on on the floor of this Senate was something that concerned them deeply as to whether or not there would be a vacant chair or two at their dinner table or whether their loved ones would walk on two limbs or see out of both eyes. I am deeply stirred at the remarks which he made, and I realized that he knew something of what it was to leave his law practice and his home and travel overseas and live the life of an enlisted man.

Mr. President, I, too, deeply detest and abhor wars and fighting. My views may well differ from those of my friends who conversed on this occasion and of the others who were present during these conversations, but all of us could unite upon one fact, and that is, that these wars must stop if we are to remain civilized human beings. No one, Mr. President, is more interested than myself and the constituents of my State in preventing this horrible outbreak by which our families are disseminated and our treasures and savings are dissipated into the winds. Mr. President, these conversations were not sinister ones. It would have been good and wholesome if instead of being more or less of a gossiping meeting among a dozen men, it could have taken place on the floor of the Senate. There was not a corrupt, sinister, unethical, or improper remark made during the entire evening by anyone.

Mr. President, the subject matter of campaign expenses for one running for a State-wide office is a delicate one. But our radios, our newspapers, and common carriers are still collecting fees and fares, making profits, and declaring dividends. The wheels of business and the profits of big corporations and medium sized ones are still going on. Even a disabled veteran, attempting to present his views to the public, cannot use the facilities of a radio station, board a train, or hire an automobile free. It costs money, as every Member of this body knows; and I regret to say that as time goes on it costs more and more. That is a subject which I should like to discuss on some other occasion, but the realities of life teach us that if we are not to be hypocritical these expenses must be met by anyone who seeks to present his views to the public. If he hedges and does not wish to enter this field of brambles and pitfalls, he had better make up his mind to stay out of public life. It was for such reason that I made the suggestion that a sum of \$10,000, which every Member of this body will realize to be a modest one, could be raised and should be raised for such wholesome purposes and for an entirely legitimate and necessary purpose.

Mr. Keenan stated that he felt that a veteran would have a peculiar appeal at this time. He was not wrong, because a veteran did run, and came within less than a thousand votes of becoming the nominee of the last Republican primary

in my State. Undoubtedly, he did say that he felt that many people of this country would be interested in procuring the necessary expenses for such purposes, and I am sure he would make no apology for this remark. But I wish to emphasize that there is a sharp difference between stating that one believes a necessary sum of money would be subscribed to present the views of the veterans in a State-wide campaign and offering a sum of money to an individual to put in his pocket as compensation for entering into any political contest. Mr. President, no such statement or proposal was either directly or indirectly made to any person at that meeting. The events leading to this informal meeting, unplanned, undesigned and unexpected by Mr. Keenan, to turn into even a political discussion, would negate the claim of anyone that \$10,000 or any other substantial sum was present at that meeting or in the possession of any individual, including, of course, Mr. Keenan, who was my guest. Of course, my colleague knows that what I am stating is true; and from his long political experience, he should well know that what I am stating is the truth.

Think of it, Mr. President. Think of the proposition that the Senator puts to this body and asks it to take seriously—that Mr. Keenan, an absolute stranger, would come into a meeting before a group of men whom he had never met and whose names he did not know, and single out an unknown man and attempt to press upon him the acceptance of \$110,000 for his own very self, as some kind of sinister gesture or bribe, to persuade him to become a candidate for office, and offer him, before this group of strangers, \$110,000 for his own very self. Mr. President, everyone at that meeting knows that no such thing happened, nor anything like it. It does not even square with ordinary common sense or the action of those of high-school age.

Mr. President, some of the events that transpired since that incidental meeting or gathering a year ago are important to review. Although Mr. Williams states that he reported promptly to Senator Nye after the meeting took place, nothing whatever happened until the eve of the primary in North Dakota, approximately 10 months later. Then, for the first time, rumbles occurred and testimony was given ex parte by Mr. Williams before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of this body. He did not mention Mr. Keenan's name but referred to a "Mr. McSheehan" and he spoke of \$10,000 and gave a distorted version of that sum of money being offered to Mr. DeWitt, who, Williams said, would have accepted it, he believed, had not Williams, the guardian angel, been present. Mr. Nye, in his public appearances—and I have before me the newspaper accounts—time and again, not in one meeting, but in several—at Minot, at Grand Forks, and all over North Dakota—10 months after he had heard this story with all of the lurid elaborations, constantly referred to the sum of \$10,000. Never once, as the newspaper accounts will demonstrate, did he mention \$110,000. This was not a new theme for my colleague. In his last primary election

he claimed that he was being persecuted by the munition manufacturers who were after his scalp, for they were the ones he said were dead set against him, and Senator Nye was Horatius at the bridge defeating their sinister propositions. The sworn truth was that they did not contribute a penny, as was shown by my sworn report to the committee. He complained of scrap that was being sent to Japan, but he never introduced any measure for its embargo. So in this late primary he used the figure of \$10,000 and left out names until he was severely shocked and frightened by slipping through by only a little more than 900 votes.

Then when he realized that he had a sharp contest on his hands by a vigorous campaigner who could state the views of the veterans, he evidently made up his mind to blow up the situation and get some national publicity, which should be concentrated in his own State; and again he adopted the martyr role. Presto. The \$10,000 is now blown up to \$110,000. Surely this is an amount that would hit the headlines; and again he could pose as a martyr chief, with the forces of evil pouring money into his State to deprive the United States of America in general of his valiant services. So he took the occasion of this talkfest and haphazard meeting to attempt to put across on the American Nation a story that is as absurd as anyone could read in Grimm's Fairy Tales. This time, Mr. Keenan, whom he attempted to connect in a nebulous way with the administration, had come into the meeting before many strangers to offer another stranger \$110,000. Mr. President, if the affidavits are examined carefully by the subcommittee, it will be found that even the \$110,000 is left open at one end to be blown up into an unlimited sum. Later I shall read some of the testimony to prove this point. Of course, it is necessary in his role of martyr to affix some sinister purpose to this entire affair. Let us analyze it for a moment. What is the crime which he charges? Even if this fairy tale could come about by the touch of a wand, was Mr. DeWitt asked to do anything corrupt or wrongful? What did these great powers of money expect to get from Mr. DeWitt if he were elected? Was he to vote to lower corporate taxes or to support the Republic Steel Co. in engaging strikebreakers to curb labor? Was he to sell out our country? Was he to join some subversive group or affiliate himself with the paid agents of foreign countries? Was he to become a stooge for money of subversive interests? Not at all. In this fantastic story one can reach from one end of these affidavits to the other and he will find that no one at that meeting even remotely suggested that he do anything other than become a candidate to represent the views of the wounded veterans of our wars. Mr. President, since when did that become a high crime and misdemeanor? That is all there is to this charge. Should these interests be represented?

Should the soldiers be aided in telling the people of their own communities and even throughout the Nation of the horrors of war and the necessities of

those who had suffered all types of horrors from shell shock to the loss of limb? Mr. President, if it were true that an individual were offered a sum of money to present these views of the American people, I do not know how money could be better expended. You will note that this stranger to Mr. Keenan was not importuned in this gathering to represent any party or group other than the most worth-while and long-suffering and deserving members of our community, those who had actually shed their blood on the field of battle. Mr. President, it is an unwholesome act, and I am bound to designate it as utterly reprehensible, to attempt to distort the objects of this conversation and make them appear to the American people as some type of corrupt, sinister conduct upon the part of any individual. Mr. President, the rules of this body state "that no Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator." But here, on the floor of this important body, Members thereof can directly or indirectly impute to others than Senators conduct or motives unworthy or unbecoming, but they are cloaked with immunity and cannot be questioned therefor elsewhere. I do not propose, Mr. President, to have a friend of mine like Mr. Keenan treated in that way by any Senator upon this floor, without raising my voice in protest.

I wish to affirm again directly and without equivocation that no sum of money was offered to any individual present by any other individual including Mr. Keenan or myself. The situation was of the nature that I have described above, and I believe it will be apparent to everyone who hears or reads my remarks that the very nature of this meeting could have produced nothing else but the situation I have described.

Regardless of the fact that I have no affiliations whatsoever with Lynn Stambaugh, I resent this action upon the part of any Member of this body to attempt by innuendo to affect his own candidacy for office. As I interpret it, this is an attempt to hit at Lynn Stambaugh, who is a candidate against Senator Nye, over my shoulder. I regard it as a brazen, unprincipled attack for purely political purposes. I cannot do otherwise, because I was present throughout this entire meeting and I know everything that took place.

I have been used to the tactics of my colleague—not alone here on the floor of the Senate since I was elected to this office by my people, but while I was Governor of North Dakota. I have known of the scurrilous charges that have been made against me, where I have been shot at and hunted through Government agents, private individuals—always with politics as the background. But when the matter has come to culmination in each and every instance, I have been vindicated, as I was in being seated in the Senate after a wierd and unheard-of type of investigation, my record peered into by investigators for a period of more

than 20 years, my private life investigated, my professional career as a lawyer attacked; but when the smoke all cleared away and the wheat was separated from the chaff and the grease smear dissolved, I was vindicated. My colleague impelled the present Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, to send a force of detectives to North Dakota to investigate my record as Governor. This was done, and I was cruelly brought into court at a cost to our Government of over one-half million dollars to answer fantastic and trivial charges. But when the smoke had cleared away and great damage had been done to me, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals found that the charges against me were unfounded.

I say today that I know of few men in the history of this country more often and more thoroughly investigated than myself. But, somehow or another, my colleague has been on the very threshold of acts that warranted the sharpest types of investigation, and he has remained free from all investigation. I would suggest that in the paper shortage that is heralded throughout the Nation we look into the tens of thousands of copies of rotogravure nature of the Chicago Tribune that were flooded into the State of North Dakota during the last primary campaign. There are countless other activities that might warrant a careful search of his record.

Mr. President, I make no bones of my position. There is nothing that I regard more highly than loyalty to this country, but I have always contended that free speech should be left untrammelled, and I have objected to notable efforts to curtail it in this country. I have visited the sedition trial where several of those who have been under Government attack are former cronies of Senator Nye's. When they were exercising what they believed to be their privilege in this country, they were welcomed; but when they were being shot at, Senator Nye was strangely absent from their side.

Mr. President, my record in behalf of war veterans did not begin at the informal gathering held 1 year ago. I am glad some members of the subcommittee are now in the Chamber, because I want them to know that in September 1942, in Monroe, Wis., the President endeavored to remove a disabled war veteran, Jack Burkhardt, as postmaster. It was charged that while he was department commander of the American Legion he had given some speeches in Wisconsin, and by doing so that he had neglected his duties as postmaster. In his place the President appointed an ex-brewery owner. The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. WILEY] protested, but over their protest the Senate Post Office Committee reported against Mr. Burkhardt. Single-handed, I brought in a minority report on the Senate floor, and, with the help of the two Senators from Wisconsin, succeeded in throwing out the ex-brewery man named by the President, and Mr. Burkhardt stayed in as postmaster, and is still postmaster at Monroe, Wis., today.

The speech I gave upon that occasion pleased the disabled war veterans of North Dakota. Andy Nomland and Neal

Williams, two of the men who made the affidavits, were especially interested, and requested many copies of that speech. Mr. President, I made no attempt to turn this into a political advantage at election time. In replying to their request for copies of that speech, I wrote Mr. Williams, the man who testified before the subcommittee, and who then was department commander, on October 9, as follows:

HON. NEAL E. WILLIAMS,
Senior Vice Commander,
Disabled American Veterans,
Grand Forks, N. Dak.

DEAR NEAL: I wrote you at the request of Andy Nomland on October 7 and stated that some additional copies of the speech given in behalf of Disabled War Veteran Jack Burkhardt, postmaster of Monroe, Wis., were available.

However, it seems to me that we had better not get these out until after election, November 3, because it might possibly be interpreted as involving the Disabled War Veterans in politics and I do not want to do this. I am interested in seeing that the Disabled War Veterans get a square deal whether in the post office or any other capacity.

With kind personal regards and every good wish to you and yours, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM LANGER.

Upon receipt of this letter, Mr. Williams wrote Mr. Nomland sending me a copy, which I now hold in my hand, and which you will note bears Mr. Williams' signature in ink, together with a notation at the bottom which reads as follows:

DEAR BILL: Many thanks for what you are doing for us. Keep up the good work. In due time you will be rewarded.

N. E. W.

My fellow Senators will note the exceptional care I exercised even at this time not to take political advantage in any way which might militate against these brave men who sacrificed so much for this country.

In June 1943 at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, the resolutions committee, consisting of Neal E. Williams, chairman, Norman G. Scharblie, Fred Gaglie, Herbert Turner, and F. C. DeWitt, all of whom have been officials of the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota, sent me 40 resolutions and 40 bills carrying these resolutions into effect, and I therefore, on June 9, upon the Senate floor stated:

Mr. President, I wish to state that, as I have said before, all the bills were carefully drawn by the disabled war veterans of the State of North Dakota. After having gone over them and examined them with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau, there does not seem to be any disputing the fact that the disabled war veterans of the United States have not been receiving the kind of treatment to which they feel they are entitled and to which I think they are entitled, in view of the fact that they were disabled in World War No. 1.

The bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of bills and the numbers, being Senate bills 1176 to 1215, inclusive, be printed at the end of my remarks, coming exactly in the same man-

ner as they appeared on page 5535 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the RECORD shows that I introduced more measures for disabled war veterans on that 1 day than Mr. NYE has introduced during the 18 years he has been here. On that day I also called attention to the fact that I had gone over these bills "with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau."

As commerce counsel for the Chamber of Commerce at Fargo, N. Dak., Mr. Neal Williams wrote me on November 9, 1942 asking me personally to call on the President and urge the reappointment of Claude Porter, a Democrat from Iowa, and Clyde Acheson, a Republican from Oregon, as members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and I took care of that request promptly.

Thereafter, in March 1943, when I was endeavoring to get an alcohol plant located in North Dakota, Neal Williams again wrote me commending my efforts. Shortly before that, I had cooperated with Senator GEORGE in eliminating from the 1942 revenue bill a House provision providing a 5 percent sales tax on freight and express charges, and Mr. Williams wrote me, "It pleases me to know that you can step in to block this unfair measure."

On February 29, Mr. Williams wrote me:

DEAR BILL: First I want to thank you for the prompt action you gave us in getting refrigerator cars for the movement of seed potatoes out of the Red River Valley.

Then, after writing me about getting the alcohol plant located somewhere between Fargo and West Fargo, he closed his letter thus:

With every good wish and again thanking you for the good work you did in jarring these refrigerator cars loose for the movement of seed potatoes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

NEAL E. WILLIAMS,
Commerce Counsel.

On July 25, a year before, he wrote me about legislation dealing with the readjustment of pay for soldiers and sailors, thanking me for voluntarily sending this to him.

On June 11, 1943, Mr. Williams telegraphed Millard W. Rice, national service director, Disabled American Veterans, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., with reference to the 40 bills I had introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are many American Legionnaires in Senate located there whom I am satisfied would help if the matter was put squarely to them by members of Legion and a hard earnest intelligent presentation of the inequalities your comrades are now suffering should be presented. Will make arrangement for appearances and suggest you wire

whom to contact in Washington who in your judgment will give most efficient and enthusiastic assistance. Have you contacted Senator LANGER?

Mr. LANGER. Within a few days, Mr. Rice came to see me.

Mr. President, how does it happen that the disabled war veterans are involved here after I had advised against the suggestion of Nomland to distribute a speech which might have involved their organization in politics?

On October 3, after I had given the Monroe speech, among other things, Mr. Nomland wrote me as follows:

DEAR BILL: I have your speech made to the Senate September 14, 1942, regarding veterans' preference. Thank you very much. I am glad to know that we have at least one "he-man" in Washington that has guts enough and sufficient brains to tell our so-called honest politicians how they have side-tracked the war veterans for the past 24 years.

May I suggest that you mail a copy of your speech to each of the gentlemen whose names appear on this letterhead and one to the Disabled American Veterans, care of the adjutant, at Bismarck, Fargo, Minot, and Devils Lake; also, mail one to the adjutant of every American Legion in North Dakota.

He then stated:

Politics will start humming around here in about a week. I am treasurer of the Grand Forks County Republican Committee so I'll be right in the midst of it.

Thanking you again for hearing from you, I am,

Yours truly,

ANDY NOMLAND.

Mr. President, let the Senate decide whether he kept his word when he said, "Politics will start humming around here in about a week. I am treasurer of the Grand Forks Republican County Committee, so I'll be right in the midst of it."

He was "in the midst of it" when he made the affidavit for Mr. NYE.

In accordance with his request, I wrote to the following: Hon. E. D. Johnson, Grand Forks; Hon. W. R. Johnson, Fargo; Hon. Arthur M. Johnson, Fargo; Hon. F. F. Patterson, Woodworth; Hon. A. V. Sheppard, Grand Forks; Hon. H. L. Turner, Grand Forks; Hon. Victor Thom, Goodrich; Hon. C. T. Hoverson, Fargo; Hon. Jans Claussen, Minot; Hon. Theodore Martell, Bismarck; Hon. Frank Mazzoni, Grand Forks; Hon. Don Daelley, Devils Lake; Hon. F. C. DeWitt, Minot; Hon. Floyd Castle, Grand Forks; Hon. N. P. Bergquist, Fargo; Hon. Thomas M. Geragherty, Fargo; Hon. Charles Wilson, Fargo; Hon. William H. Johnson, Minot; Hon. Erick Keck, Devils Lake; Hon. William Kennedy, Grand Forks; Hon. H. M. Leonhard, Bismarck; Hon. Elmer J. Pearson, Minot.

All are officials of the Disabled American Veterans with the Department of North Dakota, and to each and every one of them on October 9 I wrote:

I wrote you at the request of Andy Nomland on October 7 and stated that some additional copies of the speech given in behalf of Disabled War Veteran Jack Burkhardt, postmaster of Monroe, Wis., were available.

However, it seems to me that we had better not get those out until after election, November 3, because it might possibly be inter-

puted as involving the Disabled War Veterans in politics, and I do not want to do this. I am interested in seeing that the Disabled War Veterans get a square deal whether in the post office or any other capacity.

With kind personal regards and every good wish to you and yours, I am
Sincerely,

So, Mr. President, it is quite obvious that it is not I who is endeavoring to embroil the disabled veterans in politics.

Following the above correspondence, a group of those veterans came to Washington on September 13, 1943, among them being Neal Williams, Mr. DeWitt, and Andy Nomland. The delegation arrived in Washington on September 13. They came to my office to thank me for what they termed the "splendid services." I was giving them, and stated that for the first time they had someone in the Senate from North Dakota who was interested in legislation for the disabled war veterans. This made me feel pretty good and I invited them to have dinner with me that evening.

Mr. President, as I have said, politics was mentioned quite incidentally. Andy Nomland, not I, as you will note from the letter from the State department adjutant, had first mentioned politics, and I challenge anyone—Mr. Nye or anyone else—to find a single political letter that I have written to any of them, or to any disabled war veteran anywhere. Mr. President, they, not I, stated that Mr. Nye was "no good" to the returned disabled soldiers, and that they wanted another Senator from North Dakota who would be interested in their welfare. It was then I said that anyone in their group would make as good a United States Senator as either Senator Nye or myself, and that thousands of men and women in North Dakota could capably fill the job. Certainly there were thousands who would take more interest in North Dakota than Mr. Nye has since he has been a Member of the Senate.

It was then that I was asked whom the Nonpartisan League was going to support. I told them I had met several league leaders in the State, and that they were groping about for a candidate, mentioning several names and stated further that of course I would support whomsoever the Nonpartisan League endorsed, but I thought there was an excellent chance of the league supporting a veteran of either World War No. 1 or World War No. 2, and especially so if some of the heroes of Guadalcanal were available.

I also said it seemed to me that Mr. DeWitt had nothing to lose by running, and the league might endorse him. But even, if not, that if he ran and lost, the history of North Dakota politics showed that ever since the primary election system was inaugurated there had always been a three-way senatorial fight. That disposes of the charge that there was something wrong on my part getting Mr. DeWitt to run—going to make a three-way fight out of it, and this conversation was 10 months before the primary. When Mr. McCumber ran for reelection, Ormsby McHarg and Lynn Frazier also ran; when Mr. A. J. Gronna

ran, Andy Hiller and John Worst also ran; and coming to the League days, Senator Nye himself had been the first to inaugurate the three-way split. After USHER BURDICK had defeated Mr. Sinclair for Congress, Mr. Nye supported Mr. Sinclair on the Independent ticket. I mentioned that one of the men had become Treasurer of the United States and Nye's unsuccessful candidate, Sinclair, was put on the Mexican Claims Commission. Evidently successful candidates had seemed to see to it that opponents who conducted a clean campaign would likely be appointed to some job and mentioned the collector of internal revenue, the United States marshal, and other positions. For example, Nygaard, who ran against Nye and myself in 1938 had been rewarded by a Federal job—the very man who ran on the Democratic ticket against Mr. Nye and myself. I liked DeWitt and I urged him or some other liberal disabled war veteran to run.

Mr. President, it was heartbreaking to sit there listening to the alleged ill-treatment that these disabled war veterans of World War No. 1 had received for years at the hands of politicians holding office, the lack of attention to their wishes, the cold, brutal treatment of the men who had risked their lives, who had been wounded and gassed, and some even sent to insane asylums. This callousness toward the men who had been wounded and gassed was reason No. 1 they said for looking about for a sympathetic fighting candidate.

Mr. Williams said in his testimony that we met at 15 minutes to 9 and left the hotel at 12:30, which would be a little less than 4 hours, and during that 4 hours of conversation, many, many things were, of course, discussed. I have read Mr. Williams' testimony which Mr. Nye placed in the Record on Tuesday, and read it in 10 minutes.

Early in the conversation one of the gentlemen from Fargo stated he had recently talked with former Gov. L. B. Hanna and that the former Governor had been most complimentary in his remarks concerning me. Hanna had commented that some folks thought he had given North Dakota a good business administration, but that he had been Governor in good times, whereas Governor LANGER had been Governor during 4 years of drought when nobody was paying taxes, including the railroads, and he marveled how the State had gotten by without issuing a single dollar in bonds. The speaker, who I believe was Mr. Williams, continued, saying that Governor Hanna had stated that not only "had LANGER not permitted the State to issue bonds but he had gone to New York to meet with the financiers there with the result that for the first time in the history of North Dakota, the State bonds rated A, making them available to insurance and trust companies for reserves, which automatically made them worth considerably more." Since North Dakota owned eleven or thirteen million dollars worth, he earned the taxpayers just that much. Mr. Hanna also said he had been a very good friend of my father's and that although he was not

in agreement with me politically, he had lived neighbors with the LANGER family in Cass County for 50 years, and considered them one of the finest families in the State. Of course, I was pleased to hear this from one of my political opponents.

Andy Nomland stated at various times that he was treasurer of the Republican Party at Grand Forks and had a great deal to say about the politics, not only of the county of Grand Forks, but of the whole northeastern part of the State.

Someone else said that a short time ago he had visited someone who had been talking to the superintendent of the State hospital for insane at Jamestown, Dr. Fisher, and Dr. Fisher stated that he had never voted for LANGER, but you have to give the devil his due, he certainly did a good job cleaning up this hospital when he was Governor and it took a lot of guts to do it.

During the evening someone mentioned that he had met "Happy" Paulson of the Fargo Forum at the Elks Club. He said, "We were over there drinking" and politics came up and Happy had said, "I hate that man LANGER. I used to think I hated him the worst of any fellow in the State but now I hate Oscar Erickson worse; that the League is through; LANGER is never going back. The Fargo Forum will see to that. We are going to reelect Nye and I know what I am talking about because the Fargo Forum controls this part of the State. Our subscription list is way up. We talk to over 100,000 people a day. Since LANGER has left the State, the League has gone to hell and we are going to keep it there, and Nye's fight to unseat him down there in Washington didn't do him any good." Whoever the fellow was that was talking to Happy said, "Will you note that the Senate seated him 2 to 1 with all of the Progressives voting for him. Doesn't that clear up his situation pretty well?" "Well," Happy said, "you may think so but you wait until we turn loose when he runs again and we rehash all those bond deals." Then Happy was asked, "Didn't Bob Stangler testify to those bond cases that LANGER had nothing to do with them, that the bonds were all sold in 1934, 1935, and 1936, while Welford and Olson were Governors?" Happy said, "Yes, that's true all right, but how many people know it." Then the speaker continued, "But I tell you I don't believe Happy. LANGER has certainly helped the veterans, and the farmers, and the small-business fellows. Only the other day I heard a letter carrier say that the national magazine had an article that you were one of the best friends the post-office employees had, so you may know a lot of those letter carriers and post-office employees and rural mail carriers will know what you have been doing for them. I don't believe the Fargo Forum can beat you. Why I even talked to Francis Murphy recently and he says even a fellow like Angus Frazer, who has always fought you is getting to be kind of neutral and isn't as bitter as he was. You know when a fellow is out of the State the people kind of forget about him and they say, 'Well, he isn't such a bad fellow after all.' But don't get me wrong, you

are not going to carry Fargo. Don't think you will carry Cass County, but you are going to get a better vote than you got last time, because us veterans will never forget what you did for us, how you went to bat for us on these 40 bills. Isn't that right fellows?"

Several times they came back to the fight that had been made to unseat me in the Senate, and of them said Happy Paulson told them he felt very badly, that the majority leader, Senator BARKLEY, had told Governor Moses not more than 15 Senators would vote to seat me and they could rely upon that statement. Some of the fellows in Fargo had bet some money and lost it, and they thought that the majority leader certainly ought to know more than to say that LANGER was only going to get 15 votes, when he ended up with getting over 50.

During the discussion it was taken for granted that Senator NYE was going to run again, although he was not yet a candidate. Statements were also made that NYE would have an awful lot of money back of him, that Jaffrey, the president of Soo Railroad at the time NYE had his automobile accident, had placed his own special private railroad car at NYE's disposal, had taken him to Washington, and that the Fargo Forum had printed a picture of NYE in Jaffrey's special railroad car with a nurse taking care of him, and someone said, "How are you going to beat Senator NYE when the Soo Railroad is back of him, and when you remember that this man Jaffrey is also the head of one of the chain of banks all over the Northwest, and worth millions upon millions of dollars? Someone else also spoke up and said that Brandt, of Minot, head of the First National Bank there, had stated that his bank controlled Ward County and that he and a man named Christianson were going to see that NYE carried it by a large majority.

They asked me what I thought about the situation, and I said I thought NYE would have the solid backing of big business. Judging from LA FOLLETTE's Progressive magazine, the Girdler of the Republic Steel Co., and others like him, would back him.

Mr. NYE is the last man who should have risen on the Senate floor to make these charges. He must indeed think the voters of North Dakota have short memories. The ridiculousness of the charge must be all the more apparent to North Dakota people when they remember that only a few years ago he went all over the State saying in his speeches that I was "greedy for nickels, dimes, and quarters." Certainly my political enemies must laugh in derision at NYE when they hear him saying that \$110,000 was being paid out by BILL LANGER and his friends, and was for once not being received by BILL LANGER.

Mr. President, I am pained to have to give this speech. Mr. NYE knows I had more to do with his entrance into public life in North Dakota than almost any other man. The newspaper, the Tower City Topics, whose policy I directed at that time, as I can prove by correspondence, was the first newspaper in the State

to mention him for Congress. This was done in the form of an editorial. I lived in that congressional district, and helped secure his endorsement for Congress at the hands of the Nonpartisan League. Later, when he was appointed to the Senate, I assisted the Women's Club of the Nonpartisan League in buying him a suit of clothes, socks, shoes, and ties, and helped get money for his railroad fare down here. I contributed to his milk and grocery bills left unpaid at Fryburg when he moved from there to Coopers-town. I also wrote to the senior Senator from California (Mr. JOHNSON), whose campaign for President I had helped manage in North Dakota, saying I believed NYE was a man with liberal views and I hoped he would vote to seat him in the Senate.

In his speeches in North Dakota, Mr. NYE had said many times, "When the Fargo Forum supports me for office, you will know I have sold the people out," but, Mr. President, some 9 years ago the Fargo Forum, which had bitterly hated Mr. NYE, which had continuously ridiculed him, suddenly started supporting him, which culminated finally in their open advocacy of him and the appointment of Gerald Novius, the Forum's political writer, and one of the worst enemies of the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota, as Mr. NYE's secretary.

Mr. President, Mr. NYE has a perfect right to his views. If he thinks he was wrong in the earlier years of his office in the Senate, when he used to vote with the farmer, when he used to vote with the common people, he has a right to change. I realize that here in Washington, where a man gets away from his constituents and instead of mingling with hard-working, calloused-hand farmers and laborers, he spends his time in a city infested with slickers and blondes and cocktail parties and special-pressure groups, a man may change. I may not have changed, because I have not been here long enough, but it is significant that when LA FOLLETTE's Progressive and the Nonpartisan League supported the Senator, the Fargo Forum was fighting him, and that now the positions are exactly reversed.

Then there is the Chicago Tribune, formerly a bitter enemy of the Nonpartisan League, calling us "free lovers, Socialists, and what not," yet in the last election, as I have said, I was informed that thousands upon thousands of editions of the Chicago Tribune were sent all over North Dakota containing a roto-gravure page about my colleague. I suggest to the Elections Committee that the connection of the Chicago Tribune and its officials with the Senator might be most interesting.

Among other things mentioned by the veterans that evening was Mr. NYE's inability to get anything for North Dakota, since he would not cooperate with any President. It was said Mr. NYE fought with Republican President Harding, he fought with Republican President Coolidge, and he fought and ridiculed President Hoover, and has been fighting President Roosevelt ever since he took office. No wonder North Dakota cannot get anything. I remarked that there

might be a lot of truth there, and that I thought a Senator should try to get along the best way he can with the President and with department heads. Another man spoke up and said, "I notice you have been voting with President Roosevelt pretty much," and I simply replied that I voted with the President when I thought he was right, and against him when I thought he was wrong.

I was then asked what I thought of Mr. NYE's foreign policy and I said that Mr. NYE gave a radio speech against Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy in 1938 criticizing Mr. Roosevelt because he was friendly to Germany and Italy. One of the fellows, who was a Catholic and proud of it, said Mr. Roosevelt was condemned by Mr. NYE because the Catholics were in control in Spain and Mr. NYE wanted to arm the Germans so they could throw the Catholics out.

Of course, the Ku Klux Klan was mentioned and one man said he had seen a membership card of Mr. NYE's in the K. K. K. Then it was remarked that the speaker doubted that, because Mr. Stern, a Jew, had been Mr. NYE's best man at his second wedding, and if Mr. NYE had been a Ku Kluxer, Stern would not have been his best man. Then a veteran spoke up and said he lived in Grand Forks when F. Halsey Ambrose was the grand kleagle of the K. K. K., and that Ambrose had stated that Mr. NYE had sent for him to come to Washington at the time his seating was in doubt, and that he spent 2 months down here getting Mr. NYE seated.

As Mr. Williams testified, the conversation lasted nearly 4 hours, and as shown a great deal was said, and it is a bit difficult to remember all the various subjects now, a year later. But the general impression seemed to be that the disabled war veterans had not received the consideration and help from NYE they felt they were entitled to, and that the 40 bills I had introduced were what they liked, and that I had done a good job for them.

Now I direct myself particularly to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. GREEN), chairman of the subcommittee. To show the confusion in the affidavits of these men and in Williams' evidence, let us examine the testimony of Mr. Williams, which was not given under oath. He states that I introduced Mr. Keenan as "Tom McSheehan," but Mr. DeWitt contradicted that, and under oath stated:

At about 9 o'clock Senator LANGER put in his appearance with an individual who he introduced to all those assembled as Mr. Keenan, or a name somewhat similar, whom he explained was a friend of his who lived in Washington.

So I say to the chairman of the subcommittee that we have the man who testified before the subcommittee saying that I introduced a man by the name of "Tom McSheehan," but he did not testify under oath. Mr. DeWitt testified under oath that I brought the man into the room, and when everybody was there assembled, introduced him as Mr. Keenan.

Oscar Winter, of Grand Forks, says under oath "that he understood the name of Senator LANGER's friend to be Joe

Keenan, instead of Tom McSheehan," as Mr. DeWitt stated.

So that two of the men who were present made oath and said that Mr. Williams was mistaken when he said that I brought in Tom McSheehan.

Nor, Mr. President, do they agree on this \$110,000. After Senator Nye first heard this story from Mr. DeWitt at Minot, Nye said it was \$10,000. When Mr. Nye spoke at the Labor Hall in Minot his talk was reported in the press, and I have a copy of one of the newspapers here. He said that the sum mentioned was \$10,000. That was 10 months after Mr. DeWitt and Mr. Williams had seen Mr. Nye. When Senator Nye spoke at Grand Forks later, he said he had talked the matter over with Mr. Nomland as well as Mr. DeWitt, and the report came out in the papers and it was still \$10,000. Mr. Nye, although he was not present at the "party," as he called it, Tuesday, apparently refreshed Mr. Williams' recollection. Mr. Williams then alleged that he understood Mr. DeWitt was to get "\$10,000, and then \$50,000 more if he makes good," as appear on pages 7 and 9 of this testimony of Mr. Williams which I hold in my hand.

By this time DeWitt had evidently become even more enthusiastic than Mr. Williams, because he said that Mr. Keenan had stated:

As a matter of fact, we are prepared to start the thing off with \$10,000 cash right now, to be followed by an additional sum of \$50,000, and, if necessary, an additional \$50,000 will be made available.

So we now have \$110,000.

Upon reading the affidavit Senators will find that Charles Gran and Oscar Winters hedged. They did not say the affidavit is true and correct. Out of their hazy recollections of the many things that took place at that party is true only in what they remember of it. Mr. Shirley says he was not present in Mr. DeWitt's room while this party was on and so knows nothing.

Apparently Mr. Nomland was the most enthusiastic of all the affidavit signers. He says that Mr. Keenan's statement was:

We will start him out with \$10,000 cash immediately, with an additional \$50,000 as the campaign progresses and any additional amount necessary. Of course, that depends upon the kind of showing he makes.

So what have we here? We have one man who says that Mr. DeWitt was to get \$10,000. Then 10 months later, when Mr. Nye squeezed through by the skin of his teeth, we find the same man saying "It was \$10,000 plus \$50,000 more if a showing was made." Then we have Mr. DeWitt making affidavit that it was to be \$10,000, followed by an additional sum of \$50,000, and, if necessary, an additional \$50,000, or \$110,000. Then, finally, we have Mr. Nomland, who says:

It was \$10,000 plus \$50,000, and any additional sum necessary. Of course, that depends upon the kind of showing he makes.

There we have the statements of men who attended the party—that two of them at first said it was \$10,000; then one increased it to \$10,000 plus \$50,000 "if a showing was made"; and the next

gentleman says it was \$10,000 plus \$50,000 plus \$50,000, or \$110,000; and the last man Mr. Nye produced says "there was no limit at all," only the sky, so it might be as high as a million or \$2,000,000 or a billion.

Mr. President, this expresses better than I can possibly describe it, just exactly the kind of a party this was. Fortunately, everyone in North Dakota knows that I do not touch intoxicating liquor, and all I and Mr. Keenan had to drink was some Pepsi-Cola, and it was not spiked.

Out West we have a saying that "you do not have to eat a whole beef to know whether or not it is tainted."

In 1938 Mr. Nye was fooling the voters by accusing the munitions makers of financing my campaign, when, as I have said, they did not contribute one dime to my campaign fund in any shape or form. In the last primary election he raved about the money from the eastern interests, but when Mr. Oppegaard, of the Grand Forks Herald, challenged him to name them, he retreated into silence. Now, when he won by only 942 votes in the primary, he descends upon the Senate floor in the outrageous performance of last Tuesday. He apparently fears the candidacies of Governor Moses and Lynn Stambaugh.

The inferences Senator Nye is trying to make is that when Mr. DeWitt did not desire to become a candidate, my support was shifted to Mr. Stambaugh. May I say on that point, Mr. President, that I neither contributed one penny, collected one penny, nor diverted one penny or any other sum, towards Mr. Stambaugh's campaign. I was not then and I am not now in his confidence. I do not know where Mr. Stambaugh received a single penny of his campaign fund if he had one. I do not know anything about a campaign fund, if he has one, for this fall's election. I do know that Nye moved heaven and earth to get the League endorsement for the Senatorship—that he spent thousands of dollars and offered to pay thousands more for the League endorsement and could not induce the farmers to give it to him.

I quote from Mr. Nye's Grand Forks speech on the 22d of June. He said:

The C. I. O.—Communitic-Langer League is out to get me.

That was 6 days before the election.

The C. I. O.—Communitic-Langer League is out to get me.

This is typical of the campaign Mr. Nye made. In spite of that, if it had not been for a terrific rainstorm the night before election he would have been overwhelmingly defeated. Of course Mr. Nye is fully aware of this fact. Everyone in North Dakota knows I am not a Communist and every Senator upon this floor knows the Daily Worker, the Communist official paper, twice has characterized me as the most dangerous man in the United States Senate. As far as the C. I. O. is concerned, I have never met Mr. Murray. I knew Mr. Baldwin when he was at the head of the Farm Security Administration. I have met him only upon two occasions. I do not know Sidney Hillman.

At Chicago the time when I met Mr. Baldwin with Mr. Erickson, then publisher of the Leader, who was endeavoring to negotiate a loan to save the newspaper, I advised Mr. Erickson not to accept the offer and he did not accept it.

Mr. President, indeed this charge of my being a Communist, or being associated with communism, comes with ill grace from the lips of my colleague; and again I convict him, not by what I say or do, but by what he himself has said and done. At the very time when the fight against communism was at its height in America, it is shown that on the 23d of May, 1938, my colleague joined the Communists; who at that time were all opposed to taking up arms, even in defending this country. He introduced a bill, Senate bill 4054, a bill which had been previously introduced in the House by the Communist member from New York, entitled "A bill authorizing the naturalization of certain aliens." It reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any alien otherwise eligible for citizenship under the naturalization laws who has attained the age of — years shall not be denied a certificate of citizenship for the reason that such alien is conscientiously opposed to war as a method of settling international controversies or has expressed an unwillingness to serve in the armed forces of the United States in time of war with a foreign country.

So, Mr. President, if an alien had expressed his unwillingness to serve in the armed forces of the United States at a time of war with a foreign country, even if this country were attacked, under the terms of this bill he would nevertheless be admitted to citizenship. Any alien who had already said that in time of war he would not serve in the armed forces, even if America were attacked, even if a force should come from Mexico, South America, Canada, or Germany to attack this country, would nevertheless be admitted to citizenship under the terms of the bill. My colleague would have the sons of the old pioneers fight the attackers to protect the aliens. He wants aliens, who have said that they would not fight even if this country were attacked, to have the privilege of voting and the pioneer's son to do the fighting. And no wonder, Mr. President, that these disabled veterans, who had fought and bled to protect Mr. Nye and his family wrote me that they had been sidetracked for 24 years.

At the Republican National Convention he stated that he had won the nomination despite a campaign of the Communists, the American Legion, the C. I. O., and the Langer forces, when he knew it was the rain that saved him.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe that Mr. Nye fooled anyone in North Dakota by linking the American Legion with the Communist Party. Everyone who knows the history of North Dakota knows that in the last World War more men voluntarily enlisted in the Army and Navy from that State than from any other State in the Union; and everyone knows that in proportion to its population, more boys from North Dakota lie buried in the soil of France as the result of World War No. 1 than from any other

State. Everyone knows that the American Legion in North Dakota is a loyal organization. I say that it comes with ill grace from the senior Senator from North Dakota, at the Republican National Convention, to give an interview stating that the C. I. O., the American Legion, and the Communist-Langer forces were joined together to beat him.

Mr. President, these charges with respect to Mr. Keenan's offer to donate \$110,000 to defeat him are running true to form. In 1938, as the newspaper accounts show, Mr. Nye went up and down the State charging that the munitions manufacturers were raising huge slush funds to defeat him. The truth of the matter is that not a single munitions manufacturer or any other group of persons from outside the State contributed a single dollar to my campaign, as was shown by my sworn report to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and yet, Mr. President, no less a man than Charles A. Beard, the historian, believed these charges, and sent letters to newspapers as far west as Oregon, begging for money for Mr. Nye. I have one such letter printed in the Oregonian, in Oregon, begging for money for Mr. Nye.

A Nation-wide committee was organized to solicit funds all over the United States for him. I hold a copy of such a form letter in my hand. They did not trust the people of North Dakota to raise money to elect him. In that campaign I was faced with money raised in New York, where Wall Street is located; and if any Senator is interested, I suggest that he look at Mr. Nye's sworn report on file with the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and see from whom the money that he got in New York in that campaign came.

In the primary campaign last June, Mr. Nye pursued the same tactics which he used in 1938 when he was yelling about munitions manufacturers financing me. So outrageous did those charges become that on May 22, last, I wrote a letter to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, requesting the committee to investigate campaign expenditures. The letter reads as follows:

MAY 22, 1944.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Committee to Investigate Campaign
Expenditures, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Confirming our telephone conversation this morning, I am herewith enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Lidgerwood Monitor published at Lidgerwood, N. Dak., dated February 3, 1944, and call your attention to the fact that Senator Nye's secretary stated:

"That certain eastern interests, sort of an unholy alliance of left-wingers and the ultra-wealthy, are out to 'get Nye' and are pouring money and propaganda into North Dakota."

Also an article that appeared in the Times-Herald, published at Washington, D. C., for Sunday, February 13, in which the charge is made by H. T. Lillehaugen, of Brocket, N. Dak., "that thousands of copies of Under Cover are being distributed free" to smear Senator Nye.

Also an article which appeared in the Grand Forks Herald, published at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on January 7, in which it states that Senator Nye—

"Quite solemnly he warned citizens of this State that the open letter I wrote the other day was part of an insidious 'smear campaign' inspired by some vague 'eastern interests' bent on spending vast sums of money in an effort to defeat him from reelection this year."

On the same date and in the same paper it states:

"In connection with the smear campaign he suggested in his address, the Senator warned that within a month he expected that 50,000 copies of the best seller, Under Cover, pretending to show a widespread plot to displace the American form of government with a Fascist form, would be circulated in North Dakota by interests who seek to defeat him for reelection."

Also an article which appeared in the Fargo Forum in which Senator Nye stated:

"The New Deal had charged the C. I. O. Political Action Committee with the responsibility of electing a Congress favorable to the New Deal and that at last reports it had an \$8,000,000 fund to work with."

These charges of spending huge sums of money to defeat Senator Nye are so serious that, in my opinion, there should be the fullest investigation. If this money is actually being spent, the voters of the State of North Dakota are entitled to know it. Likewise, if these charges are false, the propaganda that this money is being sent in by so-called eastern interests and others should, for the benefit of the voters of North Dakota, be exposed.

Yours very truly,

Another favorite campaign cry of Nye was his statement that 50,000 copies of Under Cover were distributed free in North Dakota.

Certainly no one believes that nearly every family in North Dakota received a copy of Under Cover free, because it just is not true. The "eastern interests" he mentioned in his speech at Grand Forks are just as illusory, just as vague, just as nonexistent, just as much figments of the imagination, as were the munitions manufacturers' contributions that he raved about in 1938.

Mr. President, as I said before, the opposition to Mr. Nye on the part of so many North Dakota people has nothing whatsoever to do with eastern interests. When I met with those disabled war veterans we discussed other reasons why Mr. DeWitt should win, and I believe, Mr. President, that Mr. DeWitt would have won had he been the candidate, in spite of the rain. For example, let us consider the giving away, without protest on the part of Senator Nye, of the water from the Missouri River.

While I was Governor, I had set up a board to get water on these parched lands. I found that our neighboring State of Montana has nearly a million and a half acres of irrigated land, while in North Dakota, after 20 years of Nye in the Senate, we have only 21,000 acres of irrigated land. In Montana there are 1,711,409 acres of irrigated land. In North Dakota there are only 21,615 acres of irrigated land. There is nearly 100 times as much irrigated land in Montana as there is in the neighboring State of North Dakota. The same rivers flow through both States and Senator Nye had been in the Senate almost as long as had the now senior Senator from the State of Montana and he was there under Republican and Democratic Presidents.

Some of the parched land was bought for less than \$1 an acre, but it became worth over \$200 an acre the minute water touched it. Fort Peck had been built, not near Garrison, N. Dak., where President Roosevelt desired it to be built, because that would catch the water from the Yellowstone River, but by an agreement of the Senators in which Nye joined, not only was the dam built at Fort Peck, but, unbelievable as it may seem, the law creating the Fort Peck Dam provided that the water should not be used for irrigation, but for navigation purposes only. The result was and is that over a million acres in North Dakota which could have been irrigated from Fort Peck lay idle through 9 years of drought, with the farmers going broke. While irrigation projects were built in Montana, Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming, and other semiarid States, North Dakota got nothing for irrigation. There are people out our way who say the farmers' problems were neglected and forgotten while the Senator was out speaking at \$250 a night.

Others want a new Senator because the rural electrification program has not been pushed in North Dakota. In many States the farmers through the Federal Government had secured light and power for their farms to do much of the hard work and to relieve the women folks of a considerable amount of the back-breaking drudgery. I told the veterans that I had cooperated, as Governor, with State Senator Max Strehlow, of Kindred, in the formation of the first rural electrical organization in North Dakota, which has over 2,000 members. I signed the bill making it possible for North Dakota to conform to the Federal regulations, but at no time did I receive any help from the two men, then in the United States Senate from North Dakota, one of them being Mr. Nye.

I might add, Mr. President, that I have introduced a bill in the Senate, Senate bill 2140, and if that bill becomes law, every farmer in North Dakota will have light and power at cost as soon as the war ends and materials become available. In spite of the Kindred and a few other R. E. A. projects, only 7 farmers out of every 100 in North Dakota get electric light and power—by far the lowest number of any State in the entire Union. In terms of the number of farmers who are able to obtain electricity, our State is at the bottom of the list; in such a list, North Dakota is the forty-eighth State in the Union. Even in barbaric Japan, 95 out of every 100 farmers have electricity.

Really it is strange how the Senator leaves his friends. He told the farmers in the 1938 campaign, as some of the reasons why he should be reelected, that he was for irrigation and reclamation and that he was on the committee and was very powerful. But suddenly, when there was a chance to get an irrigation and reclamation project for North Dakota, he resigned from the committee, and let the farmers of North Dakota and the Northwest run along the best they could in their efforts to get Missouri Valley improvement. When they were floundering around helplessly, I resigned from

the Printing Committee to get on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to help them out.

Mr. President, the six gentlemen who signed the affidavits have served their country long, honorably, and well, and they continued to be my friends long after that meeting in the Hamilton Hotel on September 14. I want the Subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to listen to the reading of a letter which I received in March, 1944, over 6 months after Neal Williams now alleges I had wrongfully suggested that one of his comrades be a candidate for office as United States Senator. On March 30, 1944, over 6 months after the meeting at the Hamilton Hotel, he wrote me as follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
March 30, 1944.

HON. WM. LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BILL: Ever since the receipt of your letter of March 20, I have been checking to find whether there has been a revised list of disabled American veterans from World War 2.

The next attached bulletin from Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944, is the latest attempt made by our organization to obtain list of World War 2 veterans.

I am on the North Dakota Defense Council but we have no complete list. I will continue my efforts and let you have the benefit of anything I can turn up for you.

With every good wish, believe me to be,
Very sincerely yours,

NEAL E. WILLIAMS,
North Dakota Department Commander and Tenth District National Executive Committee-man.

Do you think this is the kind of a letter, Mr. President, Mr. Williams would have written me, if there was the slightest truth in these charges? Oh, Mr. President, politics, politics, politics. This letter was written to me at the end of March 1944. About 40 days later he signed an affidavit for Senator NYE about something that took place more than one-half year before. Politics, politics, politics. Is it any wonder that one who endeavors to do his duty here in the Senate, who works hard to protect the people, sometimes becomes weary and discouraged?

So, Mr. President, I now leave the Senator to get what comfort he can out of the charges he made on Tuesday. His own speeches in North Dakota, after he had talked with these men and had been quoting them in his speeches, showed that only the sum of \$10,000 was mentioned. The Senator said so himself. But the campaign is on now, and \$110,000 looks so much larger in the newspapers than does the \$10,000 which I offered to raise in North Dakota for the disabled war veterans if one of their men wanted to be candidate for the Senate—and with which Mr. Keenan had had absolutely nothing to do. At that time I said to the veterans that Mr. NYE had cost the farmers and businessmen of North Dakota millions, and that it would be cheap to get rid of him at \$10,000. Far, far be it from me to advise the people of North Dakota how to vote. That is their prerogative, just as it is

their duty and responsibility. If they want the same man that Wall Street is supporting, to represent them, if they want their interests neglected, their Missouri water given away, their wives to continue to break their backs over scrub boards and washing machines, far, far be it from WILLIAM LANGER to protest. They, Mr. President, are the masters of their fate, and the captains of their souls. They get just exactly what they vote for.

The Senator has made his own record. There it is. The Bible says that a man cannot serve two masters. One cannot serve the people of North Dakota and Wall Street. Will the Senator deny that fewer farmers in North Dakota today have less electricity and power than in any other State in the Union?

Will the Senator deny that only 21,615 acres of land are irrigated in North Dakota, while 1,711,409 acres are irrigated in Montana?

Will the Senator deny that he voted for the bill establishing the Fort Peck Dam, with the provision that not one single drop of water could be used for irrigation?

Will the Senator deny that over 1,200,000 acres of land has laid idle in North Dakota because of lack of irrigation projects?

Will the Senator deny that he resigned from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and abandoned the farmers to their fate?

Will the Senator deny that thousands of women are doing household drudgery because of the lack of electricity in North Dakota, where there are more women in proportion than in any other State in the Union?

Will the Senator deny that more fathers, mothers, and children on the farms there have to read by kerosene lamps than in any other State?

Will he deny that he voted against the bill to limit salaries at \$75,000 a year while the profiteers were making the most money in the history of the country?

Will he deny that he voted for the Ruml plan, making a present of over eight billion to the wealthy? An amount equal to nine times the value of all the assessed valuation of both real and personal property in North Dakota?

Will he deny that more multimillionaires are being created in World War No. 2 than in World War No. 1, and that he opposed the President's bills to prevent this?

Will he deny that he did not vote for an extension of Lend-Lease under which combines, tractors, grain binders, and other farm machinery has been exported wholesale to foreign countries while the farmers of our own State have been in want and begging for them?

Will he deny that he voted for the bill this year which raised money-order fees at post offices to 37 cents a piece, while banks sell them at 15 cents?

Will he deny that he voted for the bill to raise the cost to the farmers of sending articles by parcel post 33 1/3 percent?

Will he deny that he knew so little about foreign relations that as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he so neglected his duty that at

the very moment when thousands of our boys were being killed he was giving a speech at Pittsburgh saying we would not be attacked, and when informed by the newspapermen that we were being attacked at Pearl Harbor, he stopped long enough to say, "That sounds fishy to me"?

Will he deny that he offered James Malloy \$5,000 to get LANGER, whom the people had elected, unseated?

Will he deny that he paid Attorney Howard Fuller, of Fargo, the attorney's fees for drawing up charges against LANGER, who had been elected Senator by the people?

Will he deny that in this campaign he is the darling of the two big chain banks which are doing business all over the Northwest, and that they are moving heaven and earth to reelect him?

Will he deny that in the old days he stated to the people that "when the Fargo Forum supports me you will know that I have sold you out"?

Will he deny that 6 years ago he appointed the Fargo Forum's political writer, Gerald Movius, as his private secretary, and that Movius still has that job?

Mr. President, I submit that the unwarranted attack made upon me by Mr. NYE has been unanswerably answered. I say this matter has no place upon the Senate floor. I submit that the proper place for it to be determined is before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Therefore, I challenge Mr. NYE to waive all immunity, and under oath come with me before that committee and their counsel for cross-examination. I am ready now, Mr. President, for that pleasant experience as far as I am concerned. Does he dare to accept the challenge?

EXHIBIT 1

S. 1176. A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering;

S. 1177. A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits;

S. 1178. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in national service life insurance policies; and

S. 1179. A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1180. A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1181. A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10;

S. 1182. A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator;

S. 1183. A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities, but whose death resulted from other causes;

S. 1184. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof;

S. 1185. A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error;

S. 1186. A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers;

S. 1187. A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent;

S. 1188. A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children; and

S. 1189. A bill to authorize payment of pensions at combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1190. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1191. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis;

S. 1193. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability;

S. 1194. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent;

S. 1195. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications;

S. 1196. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950;

S. 1197. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from \$40 to \$60 per month;

S. 1198. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies;

S. 1199. A bill to increase to \$60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities;

S. 1200. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran;

S. 1201. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1202. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

S. 1203. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administra-

tion, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1205. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents;

S. 1207. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes;

S. 1208. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; and

S. 1209. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the Act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law No. 484, 73d Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1210. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1211. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1212. A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1213. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1214. A bill to provide for a statutory award of \$10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1215. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that the Committee on Printing usually makes provision for publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an indefinite number of days following a recess or adjournment of the Senate. I assume that such practice will continue.

Because of that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] be permitted to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what he may deem to be an appropriate reply to the statements made this afternoon by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am sorry to say that I must object. I notified the junior Senator from North Dakota, on this floor as soon as he had

finished his remarks, that I would reply to them as quickly as I could. Six days ago I said here in the Senate that I would speak yesterday. Yesterday I rose again and said that I would speak today. I know of no reason why the senior Senator from North Dakota should not have been present if he was interested, and I assume that he is. I am therefore obliged to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PRICES OF CHEESE—LETTER FROM SENATOR SHIPSTEAD TO CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, dated September 18, 1944, relative to prices of cheese.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 18, 1944.
Mr. CHESTER BOWLES, Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Thank you for your letter of September 6 which I have read with interest. I am sorry that I cannot agree with you on some of the matters covered by your letter, and particularly the following:

1. It is not correct to state that cheese of Italian types is "generally consumed by people who have, or whose ancestors have immigrated from that area." Parmesan cheese, for instance, is used in volumes of millions of pounds by American processors of food and for general American consumption. Blue cheese and Gorgonzola are found on almost every train in the country, and the Provolone cheese is used in a great many American eating places for sandwiches.

2. If you look at the enormous volume of cheese of Italian varieties imported from South America since 1940 you will come to realize that in a large measure the supply that used to come from Italy has been substituted by Argentina.

3. The statistics quoted in your letter do not agree with the figures which the Italian cheese industry furnished to the committee on reciprocal information in 1939, a copy of which may be obtained from the Tariff Commission.

4. The justification which you give in your letter relative to the reasons which prompted your office to carve a roll back on cheese of Italian varieties does not hold true if you take into consideration the following facts:

(a) The largest increase in the production of any single type of foreign cheese is found in the cream cheese which has increased more than 50 percent from 1941 to 1944. The volume of production of cream cheese is now twice that of Italian cheese of all types. The cream cheese producers are the ones that have diverted to their production the largest volume of milk from Cheddar. They are, therefore, the biggest offenders.

(b) Nothing has been done to curtail the price of Camembert, Liederkranz, and Brie, which are selling at prices that permit a return to the manufacturer far in excess of the one permitted either the Cheddar or the Italian cheese producer.

In addition to this, it must be said that these cheeses are produced almost exclusively by integrated cheese companies which are not only capable but should be willing to make some sacrifice in this emergency.

(c) The most critical dairy item at this time is butter, produced in large volumes in my State, and not Cheddar cheese. Please take into account the fact that the manufacturers of cream cheese are using butterfat equivalent to 40,000,000 pounds of butter, while the producers of Italian cheese, at the level of 1942 production, are using less than 15,000,000 pounds of butterfat. I would, indeed, be very much interested in having an explanation of this matter for the benefit of my constituents, the producers of butter.

5. Please permit me to call to your attention that the Senate Subcommittee on Small Industry has received the assurance that this matter would be attended to not later than 3 weeks from August 25. The Italian cheese industry and the dairy industry cannot continue to sustain the terrific losses caused by said roll-back for much longer time.

6. I have taken due and proper notice and sincerely wish to thank you for your promise that "if these accounting studies reflect that the manufacturers of Italian-type cheeses are not in a competitive position for the available milk supply, necessary adjustments in the maximum prices will be made."

Time is the essence of this matter and I hope and trust that, by this time, you have finished your cost studies. If you have, I trust that necessary adjustments in the maximum prices will be made at the earliest possible moment.

I believe it my duty to inform you that leading dairy product manufacturers and numerous dairy farmers have, during the last few weeks, expressed to me their serious and earnest concern about impending surpluses of dairy products, and what action the Government will take to overcome them. The welfare of the dairy farmers who have done such a marvelous job during the depression and during the war emergency concerns me deeply. I have, therefore, looked about for facts and information and I find the following:

(a) Milk powder is piling up very rapidly and in volume far in excess of civilian, armed forces, and lend-lease requirements. Many concerns in my State are already begging for new avenues of distribution.

(b) The evaporated milk industry seems to be in the same position. Consumption of evaporated milk, because of past and present rationing, and because the civilian seems to have lost the habit of using it, is decreasing. With the current production of 75,000,000 cases per year, and a normal civilian consumption of about 55,000,000, when the war ends and New Zealand, Australia, and Argentina will again absorb the foreign market for dairy products, the fluid milk, no longer being evaporated, must be diverted to something else.

(c) I am told that New Zealand has large inventories of cheese that must be consumed or be lost, that the Mediterranean basin has certain varieties of cheese of long curing ready for shipment here, that Argentina has warehouses bulging with cheese that must be sold. Our present export of cheese for lend-lease will, we hope, be stopped or reduced with the collapse of Germany. What are we going to do with the cheese that we have been exporting? We have increased our cheese production since 1940 to the extent of 60 percent. The rationing and the various orders which are hampering and disturbing the normal and historical distribution of cheese have reduced the consumption of cheese and are depriving the rural population of the country from the possibility of receiving its customary volume of cheese. Most of the cheese orders are tailored to suit the wagon jobber distributors and completely ignore the rural consumers. This will inevitably injure and reduce the per capita consumption of cheese in the Nation.

There is no doubt in my mind that by the end of 1945 we will be confronted by a large and damaging surplus of cheese. We must face this problem before it is too late.

7. Concluding: During the last 30 years, more than one-half of the cheese of all varieties imported to America was cheese of Italian varieties. This importation knocks at our doors again. It will be up to the Italian cheese industry in America to stem this importation. To do this our domestic industry must be strong financially and adequately implemented. To weaken this industry either at the level of production or at the level of distribution will mean to throw open our domestic market to dairy products from foreign competitors. This must not happen. You have the opportunity of rendering the dairy industry a service of great importance by preserving the production of Italian cheese in America. This industry was ruined by the short-sighted policies put into effect in the period that followed the last war. It took 20 years to correct said mistakes and it probably could never have been corrected had it not been for the assistance of the R. F. C.

You will oblige me if you will let me know when the protest filed by this industry will be heard.

Sincerely,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR NORRIS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have before me a few of the editorials which recently appeared in Nebraska newspapers following the death of a former distinguished Member of this body, Senator George W. Norris. The editorials show the great respect which all Nebraskans had for the late Senator. I ask that they be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) State Journal of September 4, 1944]

GEORGE NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

George W. Norris was more widely admired and respected nationally than in his home State of Nebraska. It can be said with entire truth that he was at the same time the best loved and the most reviled man in the history of Nebraska politics. His following in this State transcended party lines. It was devoted to him almost to the point of fanaticism. His opposition, on the other hand, was unsparing in its criticism of him and personal in its attacks.

This same sort of paradox cropped out during his long political ascendancy. At the outset of his career a product of the machine politics that was dominant for many years, he later became nationally known as a tribune of the people, a man "in there" at all times fighting for their rights as against entrenched privilege, to borrow from the vocabulary of the crusading liberal point of view he represented.

The political career of Mr. Norris has had no parallel in either State or National history. For 10 years he represented Nebraska in the lower House of Congress, and for 30 years in the Senate. He first attracted national notice when in the House he led in the revolt against Cannonism, a system which gave to the Speaker a breadth of power that Norris regarded inimical to the public interest. From that day he was a marked man.

The boldness with which he attacked an ancient institution attracted to him a support among the liberal elements of the Nation that grew with the years, and which,

in turn, endowed him with a courage to thrust his lance at many privileges and practices that he believed merited his scorn and opposition.

Norris also became a marked man in the councils of the Republican Party in Nebraska. While deliberately choosing the role of a party irregular, he repeatedly filed as a Republican and, each time that he did so, walked off with the nomination. Eight years ago he threw off this party disguise, and was elected as an independent. Two years ago he again ran by petition, but he lost because many who had followed him unwaveringly for his independence, resented his complacent acceptance of most that Nebraskans regarded as wrong in the policies of the New Deal.

Norris was a fighter. His appearance on the scene of action was the signal for a battle royal. That he did not always fight fair was the criticism most frequently launched against him. His chief fault lay in the fact that he was easily angered by opposition and too prone to ascribe unworthy motives to those, even among former supporters, who disagreed with him. The explanation probably lay in the character of the fighting into which Norris was constantly plunged, and in which his opposition itself pulled no punches.

Over the years he won for himself high honors in the role he had chosen. Experience and knowledge bred an ability that all came to recognize, and a sincerity of purpose that not a great many denied. Joined in the Senate with such men as Borah, Johnson, and the elder La Follette in forwarding the cause of progressivism in the ranks of the Republican party, in his earlier years he performed a distinctive service to that organization.

But repeatedly his interest flagged; repeatedly he told his lieutenants here that it was useless to struggle against conditions as they were, and repeatedly they had to draft him for a continuance in office. This bred in many minds the belief that at heart Norris was a lonely man. The courage with which he clung to his convictions led him to vote against the Nation's entrance into the first World War, and so frequently left him in the minority that if it is true that loneliness was his lot here lay the explanation.

Now that life's fitful fever has ended for him, the truncheons of political warfare have been laid aside. The people of Nebraska join with the people of the Nation in honoring the memory of a man who was faithful to his ideals, brave in defense of his beliefs, valiant in battling for what God gave him to see as right—an able man who has left a lasting impress on the lives of two generations of Americans and contributed to the structure of democracy "in this State and in the Union" bricks and mortar that will endure.

[From the Omaha World-Herald of September 4, 1944]

GEORGE W. NORRIS

Nebraska's George W. Norris will long be remembered as one of the most illustrious figures, perhaps the most illustrious figure, of what in his lifetime was called the liberal movement. If he shared some of its weaknesses, he also contributed greatly to its undeniable strength.

It is too early, on this day when his countrymen are preparing to pay their final sorrowful respects at his bier, to attempt to estimate his final place in American history.

But one key fact about his career has been made luminously clear. The people of Nebraska and the people of America believed him implicitly when he said: "My lips have never told a lie and my hands never touched a bribe." That is why he was sent to serve in Washington for 40 consecutive years, why in time he became the most powerful public

official of his State and, in a sense, stronger than either of the great political parties. The people did not always, perhaps, agree with the causes he espoused; sometimes they did not even have a speaking acquaintance with the issues he discussed. But they were convinced in their hearts that George Norris was majestically honest, and gratefully they sang the praises of his name.

Press biographers opine that Senator Norris will be remembered because of his gallant fight on Cannonism, because of the Tennessee Valley works which resulted from his tireless labors, because of the lame-duck amendment which he proposed, and because of the unicameral legislature which the people of Nebraska accepted on his recommendation.

But important as those various issues may prove to be in the long perspective of time, we surmise that generations which never looked upon his face will honor George Norris, first of all, because he gave dignity and a fierce integrity to the public service.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of
September 4, 1944]

PILLAR OF FAITH: GEORGE W. NORRIS

Among the tributes paid to a great American, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, whose death took place late Saturday afternoon, that by President Roosevelt seemed to offer the most discriminating, complete measure of the Nebraskan's service.

"A pillar of state has fallen," the President said in Washington; "a tower of strength has been laid low, and a grand old champion of popular rights has made his journey."

He was an uncompromising foe of special privilege who never wavered in his belief that the welfare of the majority is the responsibility and the duty of the Government.

There were others from among his colleagues in Congress. "Greatest Roman of them all" in matters of American liberal thought," said CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. "The common man and the underprivileged in the United States never have had a more stalwart champion," RUSSELL, of Georgia, added. "One of America's real noblemen," Vermont's Republican Aiken observed, concluding that "America is infinitely better today because George Norris lived and devoted 40 years to the service of his country."

"He was a great American and rendered his country invaluable service. I deeply deplore his loss," Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, declared. And in New York another great leader, Senator WAGNER, summed it up: "America has lost its greatest advocate of justice for the common man, irrespective of race, creed, or color. He was one of God's noblemen. His loss is irreparable."

And so it is an irreparable loss as well as a precious heritage and memory.

We believe that, as richly deserved, honestly earned, and excellently expressed as these tributes are, there is still one even greater and more impressive.

It was the unuttered sense of loss that came to millions of Americans when word spread throughout the country that Senator Norris had passed away. We know that it echoed among the men—the strong, sturdy young men—fighting America's battles on distant battle fields. We know that it entered the doors of thousands of homes in the mining regions of the United States. We know that in the valley of the Tennessee River there was a hush as its people paused to think of the man who was their benefactor. We know that all over this country, where men and women lived humbly and simply, the affection and respect which men in high places expressed so splendidly was mingled with a throb of regret and sadness that a great warrior had fallen.

Simple words are those which best describe it. Men build their lives in different molds. Those who think less of themselves

and more of others in the labors of life invariably are greatly loved for their unselfishness. The accomplishments which they achieve in the common interest endure. The memory of such a man becomes imperishable, even as his influence upon public thought continues through the years.

So it has been with this distinguished Nebraskan, and so it will continue to be.

Long after his death, the ideals which he represented in American life will continue to sustain millions of his countrymen.

In this democracy, which is America, government obtains its license and its vitality from the people. Their loyalties to its representative institutions rest upon their faith.

And what is their faith? Is it something tangible or intangible? Is it something physical and material, or is it something unseen unmeasured, and spiritual?

How is it fed and sustained?

What is it that waters it?

Their faith is such a fragile thing, and yet so strong. Their faith is so sensitive to what is right and what is decent. In all of his greatness, it was Senator Norris' intuitive appreciation of right and wrong and his unswerving, passionate devotion to conceptions of conscience that constituted the greatest armor of a man of simple tastes and habits.

Whether it was on the floor of the Senate in the midst of heated debate, whether it was in the committee room during hearings, whether it was in his office in the Senate Office Building, or whether it was in the quiet serenity of the associations of his friends or his home, conscience dictated his thoughts and guided his speech.

He was kind and gentle.

He was stern and wrathful.

But he always was just, according to his lights.

And he could say with another great commoner that the privilege of agreeing with others was the greatest joy that came to him; the necessity of disagreeing, his greatest pain.

Truth, honest purpose, and integrity in the methods he used were the lances which he carried into battle. They gave him a stoutness of heart, an amazing courage.

They consoled him in his defeats; they made him humble in his triumphs. They guarded him against the unseen dangers which beset so many men in American public life who fall victim to self-ambition, lust for power, or the spirit of personal greed.

They made him ever so eager to learn, ever so young, ever so curious to dig into the facts of constant changes in thought and living which constitute the American scene. He knew that life is ever-changing. He knew that all of the processes of science, machinery, and the physical earth itself called for constant readjustments by the individual. Changes created no bitterness and no resentment in him. They were logical and they were inevitable. Happily, it was his faith that they represented true American progress.

So many times in recent months he had said to us that love of humanity was the earth's salvation. So many times he had emphasized his belief that the first duty in a democracy is the protection of the weak from oppression and injustice by the strong. So many times he had affirmed his simple, sweet faith that, given the opportunity, people will work out their destiny with due regard for the rights of all.

It would be untrue to say that any single battle which he waged in Congress held his interest to a greater degree than any other battle. That was the surprising quality of his fights. He fought no sham battle. He fought no battles except those to which he could give the full force of his strength, energies, and mind.

In the heat of those battles, each one was real, each one forthright, each one vitally important. It was this spirit that made him

feared on the floor of the Senate by his antagonists and respected by friend and foe alike.

Because he was a man without pretense or guile, because he was straightforward and direct, because of the depths of his sympathies and the great magnitude of his compassion and understanding when the rights and the liberties and the welfare of peoples were concerned, each reform in which he became engaged spread itself in front of the eyes of the American people in clear and bold outline.

There were times when he talked to us most about the conservation of natural resources. It commanded his complete enthusiasm. There were times when he talked most about war—this war, with all of its destruction and its casualty lists—and then his eyes would fill with tears at the thought of the sacrifice of young American boys. How he hated war in all of its barbarism. How he hated the evil, brutal tyranny that had endeavored to fasten itself upon this earth. How he dreamed of peace—an enduring peace, a perpetual peace—when the labors of the men in the fields and the men in the factories would be devoted solely to the graces of living instead of to the arts of destruction.

What is the measure of his influence upon American thought; what the practical results of his statesmanship?

There is T. V. A. In its realization, it belongs to him. He created it against misunderstanding and powerful, selfish interests. It represented a 12-year fight. It began when American tides were running strongest, perhaps, of any time in American history in the opposite direction from Government ownership and operation of one of the major resources of a great region. But it stands there today against all of the tides, and it has spread to other sections of the country, including his own State of Nebraska, and to other parts of the world.

There was the fight for the lame-duck amendment, for the anti-injunction law, for the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska, and there were the fights for a hundred other just and worthy causes.

The amazing thing was that frequently Senator George W. Norris was engaged in not merely one major battle but a half a dozen at the same time. Actually he was fighting the fight of T. V. A., of the lame-duck amendment, and of the anti-injunction law—three great measures of reform generally associated with his name—and at least for a portion of the time these three great battles were in progress simultaneously.

From its earliest beginning, no man ever occupied a seat in either branch of Congress who fought with more steadfast purpose or with more bulldog tenacity. To him, a defeat in one Congress was merely the postponement of victory in the next, or in the one that was to follow the next. In one instance reactionary influences smothered one of his great reforms for five successive sessions of Congress, but it made no difference. He kept on fighting. Other men came and left. He remained to fight on.

That is faith in an ideal. That embodies courage. That explains why, in time, Senator George W. Norris came to be looked upon by the American people as the outstanding Member of the American Congress. That truly reveals his amazing accomplishments through which an American legislator honestly may be said to have affected the course of American life more profoundly than the majority of men who have occupied the cloistered rooms of the White House.

He was a believer in liberty. How fully he believed in liberty and freedom for the individual best is revealed in his sustained fight for the preservation of American civil liberties. Time and time again he raised his voice and threw himself into a battle to preserve the liberty of some unknown man or woman.

He was a believer in democratic government, and throughout his life he sought zealously to improve the machinery through which democratic ideals are maintained.

He was a believer in humanity, and the depth of his love for people is known only to those who shared fully his thoughts. For a timid and shy man was he; quiet and reserved in strange and unfamiliar surroundings; but the most delightful and companionable of beings in the circle of his home.

It was 2 weeks ago that in the late afternoon we sat for 2 hours out under the boughs of a pear tree in his back yard, reviewing steps in connection with an autobiography in which the two of us had been engaged the past year.

It was an afternoon of mellow sunshine. There was just enough coolness in the breeze to suggest that before many weeks fall would paint the leaves and then garb the countryside in rich golden browns. The talk flitted from Washington to a lake in Wisconsin; from the bluffs that line the Republican River Valley to those singing brooks of the Blue Ridge and the Smokies which form the tributaries of the Tennessee; from figures now prominent on the national scene to recollections of Smith and Lardin of college days.

But through it all ran the thread of his faith in the ultimate triumph of justice and of decency. He said then, as he had said so many times:

"Right will win."

This is the pillar of faith of all men and women the world over who believe in the dignity of man and in his capacity to govern himself wisely.

THE ST. LAWRENCE-GREAT LAKES SEAWAY

MR. AIKEN. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall offer, on behalf of some of my colleagues and myself, two amendments to House bill 4485, which is the so-called rivers and harbors bill. The two amendments which I intend to offer would include in the bill what is known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. I wish to take just a few minutes to explain my reasons for offering these amendments, and asking to have them printed at this time. I do want it done before the end of the present session.

I had hoped that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would be present today so that he might hear what I have to say. However, I understand he does not expect to return to Washington before the recess of the Congress. Therefore I must proceed, as the matter should be presented now, and the amendments I intend to propose should be printed before the Congress recesses.

On September 28, 1943, I introduced a bill providing for the ratification of the agreement entered into between the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941, looking to the early completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. This bill was referred to the Commerce Committee.

On October 27, 1942, I was advised by the chairman of the Commerce Committee that he had appointed a subcommittee consisting of Senators OVERTON, RADCLIFFE, MEAD, VANDENBERG, and BURTON to hold hearings on this very important bill, with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] as chairman. My regard for the members of this committee is such that I had not the slightest doubt that the bill would be given a prompt and fair hearing, and the recommendations

of the subcommittee made on the basis of the testimony as presented by witnesses.

I was advised that the War Department and State Department had been asked to give their opinion of the bill. Under date of March 3, 1944, President Roosevelt advised me that he thought the time had come to urge the passage of this bill, and that he had notified his department heads that he was giving it his approval.

Shortly thereafter, on April 10, Secretary of State Hull wrote the committee giving his approval to the passage of the bill, and on April 15 Secretary of War Stimson also expressed his approval to the committee. There was no reason why hearings should not have then been held.

On April 18 the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors made this statement to the Senate:

Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce having in charge the rivers and harbor bill, H. R. 3961, I wish to give notice that hearings on the bill will begin before the subcommittee on Tuesday, April 25. I have charge of the naval appropriation bill, and hope to get through with that bill Friday of this week, and then I should like to take up the rivers and harbors bill immediately afterward, because after that will come the flood control bill, which we hope will be sent over to the Senate from the House by the time we conclude consideration of the rivers and harbors bill. Following that will be the bill relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

I did not protest against the delay in holding hearings on the St. Lawrence development although the bill was introduced into the Congress months before either of the other bills, and had a definite expression of approval by the Government.

When the rivers and harbors hearing were being held, I observed that 2 days had been set aside to hear testimony on the proposed Tombigbee waterway, a project which was not included in the bill which came from the House. In view of this action, it occurred to me that the committee might be willing to hear testimony relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway development with a view to incorporating it in the rivers and harbors bill and I requested the chairman of the committee, to grant that hearing. It appeared to me that this was entirely proper since in 1941 the St. Lawrence development was incorporated in the rivers and harbors bill by the House committee, and reported to the House by a vote of 17 to 8. The bill, however, was reported out just before Pearl Harbor, and was never acted upon.

The chairman of the subcommittee denied my request to present testimony favoring the St. Lawrence in connection with the rivers and harbors bill, although he had readily granted time to proponents of other projects which were not included in the bill.

Later, during the course of the hearing on rivers and harbors, I attended a session in company with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. At that time we officially, and for the record, requested that we be given 1 hour in which to present a case for the

St. Lawrence. It was my belief that in 1 hour we could present such convincing evidence in favor of this development that the committee would gladly grant whatever time should be necessary to complete the testimony.

The chairman of the committee, however, definitely refused to grant any time whatsoever to consideration of the development of the greatest natural resource and most important undeveloped waterway in the world in connection with the river and harbor bill. The formal request and the chairman's denial were taken down by the Official Reporter. Yet, when the report of this hearing was printed, I was amazed to find that the testimony relating to the official request, which I had made on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and myself, and the official denial of our request by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], had been completely stricken from the record.

Hearings on the very important river and harbor bill were concluded within a reasonable time, and the bill was reported out. Hearings on the flood-control bill were then begun. These hearings were protracted, and considerable delay developed.

On June 12 the matter of hearings on the St. Lawrence development was again brought up, and at that time the Senator from Louisiana was less assuring in his statement on the floor. He did, however, advise me orally that he would not delay the hearings on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development. This same assurance, I understand, was given to others also.

Congress recessed on June 23. The gentleman from Louisiana [Senator OVERTON] advised me orally that he would hold hearings on the St. Lawrence as soon as Congress got to work again.

Congress reconvened August 1. There was no indication of hearings on the St. Lawrence being held. As the Senator had, in the meantime, become engaged in a primary contest for reelection, I did not urge him to hold hearings then. I had confidence that he would hold such hearings, as he had assured me he would, and at no time did I question his good faith.

Now, Mr. President, I hold in my hand a full-page political advertisement which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune-States on Sunday, September 10, 1944. It is not editorial matter. It is not the work of a news reporter. It is political advertising, and clearly labeled so. In this advertisement we find the people of Louisiana urged to reelect the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the Senate because through his position as chairman of the subcommittee he had defeated the passage of the St. Lawrence bill, and stating that he will continue to do so if reelected.

Mr. President, when I read this I was shocked and hurt, for I had given the Senator the benefit of every doubt for the delay in holding a fair hearing on the

bill. I now read from the advertisement itself:

OPPOSE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

With JOHN H. OVERTON in the Senate, Louisiana and the South need have no fear that the freight traffic that justly should pass through our ports will be diverted by greedy combinations and unfair legislation to the so-called St. Lawrence seaway.

THREAT TO NEW ORLEANS

New Orleans knows that the proposed St. Lawrence channel is a threat to the export and import business that means so much to the Crescent City. The proposal means that hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars will be spent to make an artificial sea channel through the ice-bound North to carry freight to the eastern seaboard that now more easily and economically moves down the great Mississippi through New Orleans. The proposal is doubly unfair because Federal taxes levied on Louisiana would be used to destroy Louisiana commerce.

OVERTON STOPS PROJECT

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON has successfully prevented the passage of this measure, because he is chairman of the Senate special committee in charge of legislation concerning the St. Lawrence seaway. Senator OVERTON declared his opposition to this visionary scheme when the chairmanship was tendered him; but his colleagues in the Senate, knowing his thoroughness and uprightness, insisted that he accept the appointment. This compliment to JOHN H. OVERTON's character has hardly been surpassed in the annals of the American Congress. The compliment to Louisiana should not be lightly tossed aside. But more than that, if JOHN H. OVERTON does not return to the Senate, into whose hands would this project fall?

Today JOHN H. OVERTON is the stalwart and successful defender of Louisiana's rights. Louisiana must return him to the Senate.

This appeal for the reelection of Senator OVERTON is based upon his having successfully prevented the passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill, through his chairmanship of the subcommittee. What we can expect in the future can only be indicated by his platform and I quote again from this advertisement:

My platform will be the record of my service and the promise that such a record holds for the future. Upon that platform I submit my candidacy to all the people and all the factions of Louisiana.

This can be interpreted as nothing more or less than that the same obstructive and delaying tactics will be continued in the future.

Mr. President, if we are to believe this advertisement published in behalf of the Senator from Louisiana, there never has been any intention on his part to permit a fair consideration of the St. Lawrence bill, and that the proponents of this great development must now pursue another course in their efforts to obtain its approval by the Congress.

This is all my country, Mr. President. I am not here to work simply for my State to the disadvantage of other States. I believe in the development of our national wealth wherever we find it, in whatever form we find it.

I believe in the development of waterways in any part of this country where they will be practicable and will materially increase the resources and wealth of the area wherein they are lo-

cated. When we create new wealth in one State of the Union, it cannot but increase the wealth of the United States as a whole, unless, Mr. President, the development of one State is used to delay and destroy the development of equal or greater wealth-producing projects in other States.

I say in full sincerity that I would not have hesitated in the least to vote for developments of waterways in Louisiana, in Alabama, in Pennsylvania, on the Missouri or any other part of this country where they are needed. But I must say that if any State, seeking developments for itself, indicates its intention to turn against developments in other parts of the country, I cannot support such self-seeking local interests. If we follow this practice, then we will soon find we have an unbalanced national economy.

I do not know how any person or group can be so shortsighted as to believe that they can increase the wealth of their community only by taking it away from some other part of this country.

I do not believe that we have reached the limit of our national growth. I do believe that that growth can best be promoted by a balanced development of our resources over the entire country. We must not plan our developments on a basis of sectional advantages.

There is no use in any longer ignoring the situation which appears to exist in the subcommittee having the St. Lawrence bill in charge. There is nothing to do now but to consider the development of waterways for our entire Nation at one and the same time. We cannot afford to let any one proposed development receive our approval when we are informed by paid advertising that the sponsor of such development will use every effort to deprive other parts of the country of the growth that is rightly theirs.

The only recourse left for the people of the Northeast and Great Lakes Basin, including 40 percent of the Nation's population, is to insist upon the inclusion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in the rivers and harbors bill.

As I stated before I shall, tomorrow, offer the St. Lawrence project as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill in the hope that my colleagues from all over the country will give it the serious and sympathetic consideration which it deserves.

Although the neglect of the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee to hold hearings on the St. Lawrence bill has been an obstruction in the parliamentary procedure to bring the measure before the Senate, it does not, fortunately, deprive us of any substantial information regarding this project. This is the most thoroughly and exhaustively surveyed public resource in the country, and in addition to the many official studies of Federal departments and international commissions, there are available to the Senate exhaustive hearings and the reports of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1933 and the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. In that one House hearing alone there are 2,300 printed pages of testimony. We know all there is to know about this project, and it is time to act.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET OF INFORMATION AS TO RIGHTS OF AND BENEFITS TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 100, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the pamphlet containing information as to the rights and benefits that are available to veterans of the armed forces and their dependents, published by the Office of War Mobilization, be printed as a document, and that 200,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House of Representatives, 65,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. It provides for the printing of a document which explains the rights of servicemen under what is called the G. I. bill of rights.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does this document contain an explanation prepared by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And it is descriptive of the rights of the servicemen under the terms of what we know as the G. I. bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It has been worked out by the Veterans' Administration and the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

RELINQUISHMENT OF TITLE BY THE UNITED STATES TO CERTAIN LANDS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I report favorably without amendment House bill 4286 to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. The bill involves one-tenth of an acre in the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is this the bill in which the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is interested?

Mr. HATCH. It is.

Mr. WHITE. It is sufficient for me to know that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I now ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4286) to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REDUCTION OF FARES TO PERSONNEL OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5196.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5196) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services.

Mr. WHEELER. I may say that this bill, Mr. President, was passed by the House, I think, unanimously. The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee has favorably reported it. The present situation is that the railroads give reduced fares to the boys in the armed services and also to boys who have been furloughed and are returning home, or who have been discharged and are returning home. There is some question, however, as to whether the railroads can grant these reduced fares legally. The bill would clear up the technical question of the legality of the reduced fares. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads, and others are very much interested in having the bill passed.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the bill would simply legalize a practice which is now in force?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana for immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5196) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY—LYNN W. STAMBAUGH

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that an attempt is being made, by innuendo, to involve Lynn W. Stambaugh, Fargo attorney and independent Republican candidate for Senator in the November 7 election, in the charges reported in the transcript of a hearing held by the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye].

Mr. President, as a member of the special committee, I was present at all its meetings on the North Dakota primary charges. Not one bit of evidence involving Mr. Stambaugh, directly or indirectly, was presented to the committee. Any implication to the contrary is a deliberate smear. The special committee took that same position when its members unanimously instructed the chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], to send a press release to that effect to all candidates in the North Dakota senatorial primary, of whom Mr. Stambaugh was one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the committee release printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Special Senate Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures has received testimony concerning an alleged attempt to induce a candidate to file in the North Dakota primary. The facts as alleged would constitute a serious violation of election laws and the committee has decided not to release the testimony taken until a more thorough investigation has been made.

However, because the committee's activities in this connection have been made an issue in the current primary campaign in North Dakota, the committee believes that fairness requires the statement that none of the candidates in the present North Dakota primary is involved in the testimony taken by the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have met Mr. Stambaugh, and through many mutual friends in the American Legion, I know that he is a man of character, integrity, and conviction. It is for that reason that I make this brief statement.

EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES ON RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, for the present consideration of House bill 3429, Calendar 871.

The other day I took this matter up with the majority leader and also the minority leader. The bill is a departmental measure. It was unanimously reported by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It is the bill which the Senator from Maine discussed with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I discussed it with the Senator from Maine the other day, and also with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator spoke to me about this bill, and I conferred with a number of the minority members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, including the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I have consulted other Senators and, so far as I know, there is no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3429) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1 of the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work, is

hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his judgment and discretion, to employ for consultation purposes on important reclamation work 10 consulting engineers, geologists, appraisers, economists, and lawyers, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him but not to exceed \$50 per day for any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer so employed: *Provided*, That the total compensation paid to any engineer, geologist, appraiser, economist, or lawyer during any fiscal year shall not exceed \$5,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired officers of the Army or Navy may be employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consulting engineers in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, retired personnel of the Department of the Interior employed by the Secretary of the Interior as consultants in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be so employed without deductions from compensation for retirement, without loss of or redetermination of retirement status, and without loss or reduction of retirement annuity or other benefits by reason of such employment, except that there shall be deducted from the compensation otherwise payable to any such retired employee sums equal to the retirement annuity or benefit allocable to the days of actual employment hereunder: *Provided further*, That within 60 days from the expiration of each fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the names of individuals employed for consultation purposes pursuant to the authority of this act, the period or periods of their employment during said fiscal year, the nature of the services rendered, and the amounts paid during said fiscal year to each of such individuals for such consultation services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ISSUE OF BONDS BY CITY OF KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs [Mr. TYDINGS], I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5144, Calendar 1114.

As we know, Alaska has no representative in this body. The bill has already passed the House. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. It would merely authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds for municipal purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5144) to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I believe this is the bill about which the Delegate from Alaska spoke to me. He seemed

very much interested in it, and he persuaded me that it was appropriate legislation. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSITION AND VOTES OF CANDIDATES FOR POLITICAL OFFICE ON MAJOR QUESTIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have many letters requesting information with respect to statements made or alleged to have been made by candidates for major offices and for a record of the votes of Members of the House and Senate on major proposals pending before the respective bodies of the Congress.

In an effort to answer these questions, I have had compiled a statement which I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND ISOLATION

On March 30, 1940, Governor Dewey declared, "We must elect a Republican administration which will keep completely out of European affairs."

Even after France had fallen and 2 days before Winston Churchill's famous "blood, sweat, and tears" speech, Dewey opposed any further aid to Britain because it "might lead to involvement."

On January 20, 1940, Dewey said: "Insofar as the present administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors, it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia." Again in 1940 he declared: "At last I think our administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships."

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND LEND-LEASE

As late as January 16, 1941, after Britain had barely survived the blitz, Dewey said the "lend-lease bill will bring an end to free government in the United States" and added that "it would permit the President to give away the whole Navy." The statement "give away the whole Navy" was a sarcastic reference to the President's exchanging 50 antiquated destroyers for the privilege of leasing many naval and air bases and the outright gift of the privilege for bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda, which would protect us from enemy aggressors, and which we so sorely needed.

GOVERNOR DEWEY AND RUSSIA

The President recognized Russia as a friendly nation on November 16, 1933, 8 months and 12 days after his inauguration. It was in January, 1940, that Dewey called the recognition of Russia by the United States "a conspicuous and unfortunate departure from our foreign policy," and Russia itself "a perversion of government abhorrent to the conscience of mankind."

Russia declared war on Germany June 22, 1941. Russia was declared eligible for lend-lease November 7, 1941. The lend-lease agreement between Russia and United States was made June 11, 1942.

In a dispatch from Cairo, quoted in the New York Times December 7, 1942, the Soviet Premier said at a dinner party, "Without American machines the United Nations never could have won the war."

Without lend-lease, which Mr. Dewey opposed, the United States could not have furnished the machines and airplanes to Russia, without which, Stalin said, "the United Nations never could have won the war."

GOVERNOR DEWEY ON PREPAREDNESS

When the President, in 1940, called for an air force of at least 50,000 planes and an annual production of 50,000 planes, Dewey said in a speech at Dallas, Tex., May 27, 1940:

"What is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about? To produce 50,000 planes a year it will take a plant four and a half times as large as our present plant, including all plant capacity under construction. Experts estimate it would take 4 years to accomplish this."

Within 3 years, it turned out, America was producing 100,000 planes a year.

In Gen. Sir Bernard L. Montgomery's message of August 11, 1944, paying high tribute to the Allied Armies in northwest France, he declared: "As soldiers we all want to pay our tribute to the Allied Air Forces. I doubt if ever in the history of war air forces have had such opportunities or have taken such good advantage of them." He further said, "The brave and brilliant work of the pilots has aroused our greatest admiration. Without their support we soldiers could have achieved no success."

The above statement of General Montgomery's tribute to the air forces is in diplomatic language. However, the last paragraph, "Without their support we soldiers could have achieved no success," means in plain, frank language that without their support we would be losing this war. Without superiority in the air the aviators could not give him any support, and Governor Dewey criticized the President for requesting the appropriation to build at least 50,000 airplanes a year, which makes us supreme in the air.

CONGRESSIONAL VOTES

In the House the Republicans voted against the naval expansion bill. In March, 1939, they voted against a bill to increase our air forces to a total of 6,000 planes. In June, 1939, in the House, they voted 144 to 8 to reduce the appropriation for the Army Air Forces. In September, 1939, they voted 6 to 1 against the repeal of the embargo. In September, 1940, after France had fallen and the blitzkrieg against England had begun, the Republicans in the House voted 112 to 52 against the Selective Service Act.

In February, 1941, the Republicans in the House voted 135 to 24 against lend-lease.

In August, 1941—4 months before Pearl Harbor—the Republicans in the House voted 133 to 21 to disband that part of the armed forces built from the selective-service personnel.

Comparison of House and Senate votes

LEND-LEASE			
House:	For	Against	
Republicans.....	24	135	
Democrats.....	236	25	
Senate:			
Republicans.....	10	17	
Democrats.....	49	13	
ARMING MERCHANT SHIPS			
House:			
Republicans.....	22	137	
Democrats.....	189	53	
Senate:			
Republicans.....	6	21	
Democrats.....	43	15	
SELECTIVE SERVICE			
House:			
Republicans.....	52	112	
Democrats.....	211	33	
Senate:			
Republicans.....	7	10	
Democrats.....	40	15	

IF DEWEY HAD BEEN PRESIDENT

Now let us visualize a picture of what would be the condition of the world today in general and the United States in particular if Dewey had been President in the last 8 years instead of Roosevelt.

Poland was invaded by the Germans September 1, 1939, and fell within 27 days, on September 27, 1939. France was invaded by the Germans June 6, 1940. France fell, with 5,000,000 armed soldiers, June 22, 1940. The evacuation and horrible slaughter at Dunkirk of the British was May 29, 1940. Russia declared war on Germany June 22, 1941. You will note that the German hordes, with the largest and best trained army in the world, superior in arms and ammunition and especially in airplanes, were running pell-mell over Europe. England was tottering to her fall May 13, 1940, and it seems that Hitler was on the way to reach his goal to be the emperor of the earth.

President Roosevelt realized that we would soon be engrossed in this terrible holocaust, and began to prepare. He asked for at least 50,000 airplanes per annum, and Mr. Dewey criticized him. He asked for lend-lease, and Mr. Dewey criticized him. Without this action on the part of the President, which gave him authority to extend lend-lease, which he did to England when England was tottering to her fall, we could not have furnished England arms, ammunition, and especially airplanes. He extended lend-lease to Russia when it looked like Russia would fall. He extended lend-lease to the French underground and all European underground forces of the Allies. And the most powerful weapons of all that he furnished our allies were airplanes. And with our superiority and unlimited capacity to produce airplanes, ships, and tanks, we are winning this war. If Mr. Dewey had been President he would have opposed all of this legislation; therefore, we would be losing the war. After Hitler would have conquered England, Russia, France, Poland, and all the other European countries, what next? Portugal, Spain, and Turkey, neutral, would have fallen all over one another to get into the German bandwagon for victory. Then on to South America, where he had his bund and satellites in every country. Also, the same applies to Mexico. He would have overrun those countries which rebelled and were helpless on account of the lack of arms, ammunition, and airplanes, and he would have conquered them. He would have also destroyed or taken the Panama Canal, and we, without any doubt, would have had to ask for an armistice or continue a long, costly, and cruel war to save our liberties. This would have been our end if Mr. Dewey had been President of the United States in the last 8 years.

HOSPITAL SHIP "CHARLES A. STAFFORD"

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I had the opportunity on the 9th of September to inspect one of the Army's newest hospital ships at the port of New York. The vessel is named for the late Capt. Charles A. Stafford, of the United States Medical Corps, who was killed in action on March 3, 1942, during the evacuation of Java.

I was escorted on this interesting and impressive tour of the *Stafford* by the Commanding General of the Port of Embarkation of New York, Maj. Gen. Homer M. Groninger, members of his splendid staff, and Mr. John Brownlie, president of the A. B. C. Steel Equipment Co., of New York, whose firm of marine joiners completed for the Army the *Stafford's* interior accommodations.

In every detail this magnificent vessel is a tribute to the genius of Army plan-

ning for every eventuality, and Lt. Col. George Schuhmann, the port's surgeon, pointed out to me the completeness of the medical arrangement. No hospital on land offers more in the way of facilities for our wounded soldiers than does the *Charles A. Stafford*, hospital ship.

As it went into service the other day, the *Stafford* was the twenty-second such vessel to be converted from former passenger liners to hospital ships. The *Stafford* was the former luxury liner *Siboney*, which operated between New York and Havana, and today is the fastest hospital ship afloat. It was converted rapidly and efficiently at the Bethlehem Steel Corporation's 56th Street shipyards at Brooklyn from plans prepared by the Conversions, Maintenance, and Contracts Branch of the Port of Embarkation's Water Division.

The *Siboney* saw service as a troop ship in World War No. 1, as well as in this war, before being sent to drydock to be converted and equipped as a 700-bed hospital ship. Designed as a fast passenger ship for the line operating between New York and Havana, the vessel, upon completion early in 1918, was taken over by the Army for use as a troop ship. It established outstanding records as one of the fastest United States transports in World War No. 1.

Following the war, the ship was taken over by the New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Line, and for a number of years operated on the New York to Havana run. In 1941, when the need for additional Army transports became apparent, the *Siboney* again was requisitioned as a troop ship, and made several voyages. About a year ago it became evident that the *Siboney's* boilers were beyond repair and that replacements were necessary. When new boilers were delivered early in 1944, the Office of the Chief of Transportation decided, in view of the length of time required for reboiling, to convert the ship concurrently into a hospital ship. With the installation of new boilers, the ship has been modernized in appearance. The reboiling has made it possible to eliminate one of the ship's two stacks.

Col. G. P. Cross, who, I understand, is responsible for much of the interior engineering and planning of these hospital and troop ships, explained to me in considerable detail the vast amount of labor and ingenuity so necessary to such conversion jobs. I was particularly impressed with the ship's accommodations—the modern operating rooms, the galleys, wards for the wounded, and staterooms for the medical personnel—in short, with everything which has been done to make the voyage home for our ill and wounded as comfortable as possible.

AMERICA'S PART IN FUTURE RELATIONS AMONG NATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, both yesterday and today I very much desired to discuss some questions regarding the part which this Nation is to play in the future relations among the nations of the world, in order to devise some plan which might prevent, or at least tend to prevent, war.

So, Mr. President, I have prepared, and have on my desk, what I think to be an interesting discussion of this most important question. In the manuscript which I have before me I say that on yesterday two notable speeches were made relative to the part this country should play with other nations of the world in forming an organization to prevent war.

Mr. President, I am sorry that question does not attract more attention on the floor of the Senate. I regret that Senators are so much more interested in their own personal concerns that they hold private conversations. I do not say that because anything I could say would be at all important, Mr. President, and I am not going to attempt at this late hour in the afternoon to state the thoughts which I have written on paper, and which are deep and burning in my own mind and heart.

Mr. President, yesterday, as I said, two notable speeches were delivered on the floor of the Senate. They were not delivered from this side of the Chamber; they were not uttered by Democrats. Frankly, I wish they had been. Those speeches were made by two Members of the minority party, by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

My purpose today is merely to associate myself with those Senators and with the sentiments they have expressed, and to say, among other things, that I hope that Senators of the United States—and, Mr. President, I am still looking at other Senators who are talking, who are not at all interested in what is being said, who are holding their own private conversations—I repeat that I hope that some time Senators of the United States will be as honest and as brave and as courageous as are the boys of America who are fighting and dying while Senators talk.

Mr. President, I yield to anyone who desires to have the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Edward Macauley, of California, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from September 26, 1944 (reappointment).

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter Thurston, of Arizona, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to

El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia;

John F. Simmons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and counselor of embassy at Rio de Janeiro, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador;

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Government of Poland now established in London;

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Stanley K. Hornbeck, of Colorado, now Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to The Netherlands;

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London;

Lithgow Osborne, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Government of Norway now established in London;

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, former Minister to Latvia and Estonia, now assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia; and

George Wadsworth, of New York, now diplomatic agent and consul general at Beirut and Damascus, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lebanese Republic and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have reported a number of nominations of ministers and ambassadors. They are all nominations of career men, and are routine promotions and transfers. I have consulted the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] about them. It is very important that the nominations be confirmed before the call of the calendar. I ask that they be now considered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I join in the expression of the hope that the nominations will be considered and acted upon at this time. I understand, in addition to what the Senator from Kentucky has said, that the Senators from the several States concerned have been contacted and that they have indicated approval.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. All such Senators have been contacted and they have expressed their approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE CALENDAR

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Theodore P. Wright, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard, of Pennsylvania, to be Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia.

Mr. **BURTON.** Mr. President, on this nomination I believe a statement should be made to the Senate on behalf of the several members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I wish to follow the statement with a motion that the nomination be recommended to the committee, with a request that the committee hold a hearing on it.

If I may now proceed with the statement, it is to this effect: There is nothing closer to the welfare of the Nation than local government; and, peculiarly enough, the United States Congress has a certain assignment of local government. That is the assignment in the District of Columbia. It is perfectly clear that the most important function of local government is good administration. Although the Senate and the House may act on questions of legislation, the Senate has a peculiar responsibility with respect to appointments to positions within the District of Columbia where they come before us for confirmation, because the government of the District of Columbia can be no better and no sounder than the character of the officials appointed to administer that government.

We have a peculiar responsibility, because under the present law Congress has not permitted the residents of the District of Columbia to vote. At one time they were able to vote and to elect their officers, or some of them. At the present time they do not have that right.

Naturally, Congress must depend upon committees in its work affecting the District. It has been my assignment since I have been a Member of the Senate to serve on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for the past 4 years.

I realize thoroughly that the Senate must depend upon that committee for a good deal of its material relating to the District of Columbia. When it comes to appointments, the Senate must depend upon its committee, because, of course, the House of Representatives has no jurisdiction of that matter.

Therefore, it seems to me peculiarly important that in the case of appointments in the District of Columbia which require confirmation by the Senate, there be a meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that in cases in which there is any kind of a protest, particularly one from the people of the District of Columbia, there be an opportunity to have such protest heard before

that committee, before the Senate undertakes to act upon the appointments. Otherwise, the people of the District of Columbia most directly affected by the appointments are in effect deprived of an opportunity to make known their point of view on the particular vital appointments having to do with the administration of their affairs.

I believe that special care should be used in a case of this kind. The office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia is one which deals with local conditions in the District. When charges or objections are raised in connection with such an appointment, I believe it to be unfair to the nominee, to the District, and to the Senate, not to afford an opportunity for consideration of the charges on their merits.

In this case, therefore, my reason for raising the objection is that the position is an important one, and the Senate is entitled to a recommendation from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Protests have been filed. I am not familiar with the basis of the protests, because no opportunity has been afforded for members of the committee to meet with the nominee, or to hear the protests in committee.

There appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 22, 1944, a statement quoting Dr. Edward F. Harris, president of the Federation of Civic Associations. The membership of the Federation consists primarily of Negroes of the District. Dr. Harris is quoted as saying:

I think this job should go to a Washingtonian, instead of being a national political plum awarded for vote-getting purposes. I have advocated its being placed under the District Commissioners.

I have also received a telephone message from Harry Wender, president of the Federated Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, which is interested in civic affairs, and the membership of which consists primarily of white citizens of the District of Columbia. They have acted through their District board. Mr. Wender reported to me that he wished to communicate through me to the Senate that the position of his organization is that the office in question is one of importance to the community, is peculiarly a local office, and one which has been filled in the past by a Negro appointee. The members of this organization do not have the slightest objection to the office being held by a representative of the Negro race. They rather advocate that it be so held, but that the appointment be made from among the eligible and competent Negroes of the District of Columbia.

That is not all, Mr. President. Protests have been twice expressed in the newspapers of the District of Columbia. The newspapers naturally represent, to some extent, at least, the opinion of those residing in the District with regard to the pending appointment. It seems to me that the character of the criticism is such that the Senate owes it to the people of the District of Columbia, and to itself, to see that an opportunity is afforded for a hearing on the merits of the question.

Mr. President, I refer to an editorial entitled "A Spoilsman's Office," appearing in the Washington Star of August 23, 1944, in which the following statement is made:

Washington Negroes, who since the days of Frederick Douglass have regarded the office of recorder of deeds as reserved for deserving colored citizens, were anxious that a Washington man be appointed to succeed the late Dr. William J. Thompkins. Vain hope!

This office is a political plum at the disposal of the politicians. The recorder is never selected because of any special equipment for the duties involved, nor in any recognition of the fact that the voteless taxpayers of the District pay his salary. The real administrative work is done by the deputies, not the recorder, who, being a free spirit, is left to wander as he wills on political missions hither and yon. It is said that the most recent incumbent spent a third of his time out of Washington. Since Mr. Douglass, every man who held the job save one has been a Negro citizen, but none of these has been a Washingtonian.

The political complexion of this office has given it a unique status among District agencies. While the Commissioners are legally responsible for the expenditure of its funds, the recorder has successfully resisted an audit of the accounts by the District—in spite of a threat from the House District Appropriations Subcommittee this year that unless one were made, funds for the office would be cut off.

I also quote from an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of September 16, 1944, as follows:

PATRONAGE GRAB

Nomination of the Reverend Marshall L. Shepard, of Philadelphia, to be recorder of deeds in the District is one of the most flagrant pieces of political jobbery that has come to our attention this year. Only one explanation of the appointment can be made. This Philadelphia preacher is being paid off for his services as head of the Negro section of the Democratic Speakers' Bureau. Through the influence of Senator GUFFEY, he is to be put on the District pay roll at \$8,000 a year in the hope of swinging Pennsylvania into the Democratic column in November.

By tradition the Recorder of Deeds in the District is a Negro. The position is one of a limited number in the local government to which Negroes are customarily appointed. That makes it all the more outrageous that many well-qualified colored citizens of the disfranchised District were passed over in order to use this important post to pay a political debt. And to cap the climax the Senate District Committee bowed to this patronage grab by proxy without so much as a hearing on the nominee's qualifications or even a meeting of the committee.

I have before me another editorial, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of September 19, 1944, entitled "Carpetbagging in D. C."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARPETBAGGING IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Senator McCARRAN's reply to the "carpet-bag" appointment of a Philadelphia clergyman to be recorder of deeds in the District is to propose a law requiring the appointment of bona fide local residents to such municipal positions. The former chairman of the Sen-

ate District Committee is properly disturbed by this misuse of an important local office as a political reward on the eve of a national election. Along with many Members of the Senate and thousands of local residents, we share his resentment. But we would much prefer to see the objective he has in mind accomplished in some other way.

It is true that many District jobs are given to nonresidents. That fact is especially noticeable from the list of judges serving the District. Local men are seldom appointed because residents of the disfranchised Capital City are not in a position to bring pressure upon the appointing officials. We have often cried out against this unreasonable and unfair practice, and are thus inclined to look with favor upon any means of insuring the appointment of more District residents to local positions. At the same time we recognize that a rigid statute requiring all local officeholders to be bona fide District residents might at times work to the disadvantage of the community.

Occasionally it may be desirable to seek specialists, such as a health officer or a director of public welfare, from other cities. We do not think the door should be closed to such appointments, when made on the basis of merit alone, although it is certainly the best practice to put local men in local jobs if their qualifications are equal to those of experts who might be obtained elsewhere. It is possible, of course, that Senator McCARRAN's proposed bill may be qualified so as not to substitute the disadvantages of provincialism for those of carpetbagging. At least in the present instance, however, a more direct remedy is at hand.

It is absurd, in any event, to have the President appointing a local recorder of deeds. That unnatural arrangement is an invitation to use the position for the payment of political debts. The office should be brought under the local government and the appointment left to the District Commissioners. That would not disturb the tradition that this office is held by a Negro. On the contrary, the Commissioners could be expected to select for this \$8,000 job an outstanding Washington Negro. As matters stand, the position can scarcely be regarded as a local office, but only as a bit of spoils awarded for the benefit of whatever party happens to be in power.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I do not necessarily endorse everything stated in those editorials, and I do not have all the information set forth in them, but they reflect statements made in behalf of the people of the District of Columbia by responsible citizens of the District. It seems to me that it would be appropriate to afford an opportunity for consideration of the arguments in favor of the nominee, and also of those in behalf of the people of the District of Columbia, before final action on the appointment is taken.

The recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia is not required by law to be a citizen of the District. But since becoming a Member of the Senate I have recognized that there is a distinct policy of Congress bearing upon appointments in the District which emphasizes the value of drawing the appointees from the District. By statute it is required that civilian Commissioners of the District shall have resided in the District 3 years before appointment; that members of the Public Utilities Commission shall have resided for 3 years in the District before appointment; that the people's counsel shall have resided for 5 years in the District before appointment; that

judges of the municipal court shall have resided in the District for 5 years before appointment, or shall have served as judges in another District court; and that members of the Municipal Court of Appeals shall have resided in the District for 5 years. As to the juvenile court, it is stated that the appointment shall be made preferably from residents of the District. Notaries public are required to reside in the District of Columbia, or have their sole place of business in the District of Columbia.

Among appointees in the District only the following are not subject to the requirements which I have stated:

The Engineer Commissioner, who comes from the Engineer Corps of the Army, and three assistant commissioners, who come from the Engineer Corps of the Army and who of course are not required to have the qualifications which I have stated; the recorder of deeds, the register of wills, members of the United States district court, and members of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. They are all, however, subject to approval by the Senate.

As to Federal court appointments, we know that there is a precedent in the Judiciary Committee whereby, whether a protest has been made or not, a time is always set for a hearing upon the qualifications of a nominee for the Federal court. As stated, the recorder of deeds and the register of wills are not required to have residence within the District of Columbia.

When the nominee is not a resident of the District, I believe the Senate owes a peculiar obligation to hold a hearing on his appointment, because the people of the District cannot possibly know the personal qualifications of the nominee. They should have a forum in which they may present their views, and the nominee himself should have a forum in which he may present his qualifications.

The Senate has a special responsibility in the present instance because the office in question does not operate under the control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It is practically an independent office and operates under its own control. Neither does its audit come under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners. Members of the Senate have considered for some time proposing legislation which would require the office to be brought under the same audit to which other District offices are subjected.

Finally, Mr. President, it has been customary to appoint a Negro to this position. I regard that as a commendable policy. But to put the office on a political basis and not afford an opportunity to the nominee to present his merits is not a compliment to the nominee or to the process.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is vitally important to the welfare of the District, and to the standard of service which should be associated with the office, that the Senate should require that an opportunity be given to the nominee to present his merits to the committee, so that when the question arises as to whether there may be an audit of the accounts of his office, he may recognize the fact that such a question is one for

the Senate to consider on its merits and not on a political basis. It seems to me that if it appears to him from the start that the only qualification he must have for this office is one of political expediency, proper protection will not be provided for the incumbent, nor will the Senate render proper service to the public in connection with the matter.

I may say, therefore, that I feel the obligation to make this motion, because four members of the Committee on the District of Columbia have joined in a letter to the chairman of the District Committee under date of September 18, signed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and myself, four members of the Senate committee, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1944.
Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO,
Chairman, Committee on the District
of Columbia, United States Senate
Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Recommendation of nomination of Marshall L. Shepard

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: The undersigned members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully request that an opportunity be given to the committee to consider, in a meeting of the committee, the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard for Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. There was submitted to the Senate on September 15, to the surprise of the undersigned, by Senator ARTHUR WALSH of New Jersey a report recommending confirmation of this nomination in which it was reported that a majority of the members of the committee had joined although no meeting of the committee had been called to consider the nomination and although, in one or more cases, no request for approval of the nomination nor any notice of a meeting on the nomination was submitted to the Senators signing this request.

Inasmuch as this appointment carries with it a salary of \$8,000 per year and large responsibilities over which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia exercise little, if any, authority, a special obligation rests upon the Senate and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in acting upon the nomination. Also, in view of the policy repeatedly expressed in recent legislation to the effect that holders of appointive offices in the District of Columbia shall be residents of the District for several years prior to the appointment, an especial obligation rests upon the Senate and this committee to consider this nomination as the nominee is not a resident of the District, and, therefore, the citizens of the District do not have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with his qualifications and must rely upon the Senate and this committee to make such investigation on their behalf.

Under these circumstances, the undersigned request that the chairman of the committee join with them in asking the Senate to recommit this nomination to the committee in order that a meeting of the full committee may be held to consider the same and that consideration may be given to the holding of hearings either by the full committee or a subcommittee thereof on this nomination.

Yours respectfully,

ARTHUR CAPPER.
STYLES BRIDGES.
HAROLD H. BURTON.
HARLAND J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. President, I wish to add that I was interested a few days ago when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH]

presented this matter. He did present to the Senate a statement as to the qualifications of this particular nominee, and that was the first time those qualifications had come to my attention. There is no doubt much can be said for the nominee. As a matter of fact, the making of my motion at this time is quite as much to prevent this action becoming a precedent for further cases as it is to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

I particularly call the attention of the Senate to another letter in which four Members of the Senate have joined and sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia, dealing with another nomination which is now pending before the committee, and in order that there may be notice of this nomination, I wish also to read this letter. It is for this reason that I take this occasion of emphasizing this subject as a precedent.

The letter is addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], dated September 18, signed also by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and myself. It relates to the nomination of Guy Mason for reappointment as Commissioner of the District of Columbia. The letter reads:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1944.
Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO,
Chairman, Committee on the District of
Columbia, United States Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

NOMINATION OF GUY MASON FOR REAPPOINTMENT
AS COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: The undersigned members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully request that before any recommendation is filed with the Senate on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia as to the confirmation of the reappointment by the President of Guy Mason as a Commissioner of the District, a meeting of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia be held to consider the question.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the fact that in October 1943 a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, consisting of Senators RUFUS C. HOLMAN, C. DOUGLASS BUCK, and HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, following an investigation of conditions at Gallinger Hospital, recommended the immediate removal of Commissioner Mason from office. Senator PAT McCARRAN, then chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, strongly endorsed the findings of this subcommittee and all of its recommendations. The report was reviewed in detail in one or more meetings of the full committee. Its findings were approved and certain of its recommendations were recommended, while action on others, including that of the removal of Commissioner Mason, was postponed, but not disapproved.

At that time it was pointed out that the committee shortly would have an opportunity to take action on Commissioner Mason's reappointment when his 3-year term expired if he was renominated for the office.

Under these circumstances, the undersigned feel that the nomination of Commissioner Mason should be considered fully by the committee in a regularly called meeting, and that in justice to the people of the Dis-

trict of Columbia, Commissioner Mason, and the subcommittee of this committee, consideration should be given to the holding of hearings on his nomination.

The undersigned especially request that no recommendation as to this nomination be filed with the Senate as a result of polling the committee or otherwise acting on behalf of the committee without a meeting of it.

Yours respectfully,

STYLES BRIDGES.
ARTHUR CAPPER.
HAROLD H. BURTON.
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. President, I therefore move to recommit the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and request that the committee hold a hearing on the nomination. I again emphasize that the special object in making this motion is to prevent a precedent being established in this case which might trouble us in the future.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not intend to burden the Senate with a lengthy discussion. There is little I can add to my remarks of a few days ago when I read into the RECORD certain qualifications of Dr. Shepard.

I explained that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], had been ill. He did poll the committee, and I was delegated to report favorably on the nomination.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] I believe quoted from an editorial in which Mr. Edward F. Harris, president of the Federation of Civic Associations, attacked the nomination of Dr. Shepard.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The quotation with regard to Dr. Harris was not an editorial, it was a news item, in which he recommended that the appointment be made

from the District of Columbia rather than from outside the District.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. It seems it might be appropriate to read into the RECORD two or three paragraphs from an editorial which appeared in the Washington Tribune of Saturday, September 2. The Washington Tribune, I am informed, is the only colored newspaper published in the District of Columbia. I quote:

Negroes in Washington are content with the manner and method by which the holder of this post is selected, and we are glad that the Presidents, with but one exception, have seen fit to honor the Negro race for the past 50 years, in making the appointment.

By the same yardstick that other prominent Negroes have been measured in the selection of a recorder, the Reverend Mr. Shepard meets every test eminently.

A fearless leader—no Uncle Tom—Negroes will be well represented by his presence in Washington. Well educated, with enough degrees to bury Mr. Harris, the Reverend Mr. Shepard has worked the better part of his life for political, social, and civic betterment of our people, with a marked degree of success, and whether he comes from Pennsylvania, the District, or West Hell, he is welcome to his new post, Mr. Harris to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following my remarks a list of the former holders of the office of Recorder of Deeds since 1881, and the names of the Presidents who appointed them. In all but 1 out of 12 instances, the appointee was from outside the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the colored race appointed to the position of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, the States they were from, and by whom appointed, are as follows:

Recorder	State	President	Year
Frederick Douglass	Maryland	James A. Garfield	1881
James Monroe Trotter	Massachusetts	Grover Cleveland	1887
Bianche K. Bruce	Mississippi	Benjamin Harrison	1890
Charles H. J. Taylor	Kansas	Grover Cleveland	1894
Henry P. Cheatham	North Carolina	William McKinley	1897
John C. Dancy	do	Theodore Roosevelt	1902
Henry L. Johnson	Georgia	William H. Taft	1910
John F. Costello (white)	District of Columbia	Woodrow Wilson	1916
Arthur G. Froe	West Virginia	Warren G. Harding	1922
Jefferson S. Coage	Delaware	Herbert Hoover	1930
William J. Thompson	Missouri	Franklin D. Roosevelt	1934
Marshall L. Shepard	Pennsylvania	do	1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I cannot quarrel with the sincere beliefs of the able Senator from Ohio that it is preferable to have nominees appear before a committee, and to avoid the practice of polling members of committees. However, I think it would be unwise in this case to change the procedure between nomination and confirmation when the nominee involved is a distinguished member of the colored race. So I urge that the motion of the able Senator from Ohio be not agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned by my good friend the able Senator from Ohio, and inasmuch as I served for some time as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to say

that the statements made in the letter read by the Senator from Ohio are correct.

When the renomination of Commissioner Mason comes before the Senate I shall make it a point, if I am then a Member of this body, to be present, and to oppose with all my strength confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Mason. My reason for that attitude is Mr. Mason's conduct before the Committee on the District of Columbia when he practically scoffed at the idea of giving any statement, explanatory or otherwise, pertaining to a public institution over which he had control.

As regards the immediate subject, I shall vote against the motion of the Senator from Ohio, because I joined in vot-

ing for the confirmation of the nominee. I did so reluctantly but, nevertheless, emphatically; reluctantly because I have learned to believe, from 12 years of service on the District of Columbia Committee, that appointees to positions within the District should come from among the body of the people of the District of Columbia.

Let me deal with the subject now at hand. The Recorder of Deeds has for a long time been selected from the Negro race, and the occupants of that office have served the office and the people well. Nearly one-third of the population of the District of Columbia is of the colored race. I say without fear of contradiction that there are in the District of Columbia, among the people of the colored race, those who are as outstanding from an educational standpoint in that race as any in the world. So the selection could well have come from among that portion of the colored race which abides in the District.

Mr. President, the population of the District of Columbia at the present time is nearly 1,000,000—men, women, and children—many of whom have lived here for many years, many of whom were born and reared here, and are the product of the schools of the District of Columbia. They have lived here all their lives. They love and live, marry and give in marriage, and then at the end of their time die and are buried here in the District of Columbia. The District is a great center of the very finest citizenry in the world. Out of that citizenry there could with entire propriety be chosen those who would serve in public office.

I shall speak frankly, Mr. President, without any idea of drawing political lines, because both parties have indulged from year to year and from time to time in the practice of appointing to office in the District of Columbia men from outside the District whether a Republican administration or a Democratic administration was in office; so there is no party line to be drawn in this respect. In my judgment no appointee for public office in the District should come from outside the District. Nominees for positions in the District, from the judiciary down to the lowest office in the District of Columbia, should be selected by the President or the appointive power from among the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from Nevada, but so long as the present system exists, whether the administration in power be Republican or Democratic, the Senator's desire and my desire that officials of the District of Columbia be selected from the population of the District of Columbia will not be acquiesced in, and such a thing will not happen until the Congress assumes the responsibility and passes a law to that effect.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico, and I am grateful for his interruption, because that is exactly the thought I wish to express.

If I shall continue to be a Member of this body I shall introduce a bill to the effect that appointees to public office in the District of Columbia shall be from among the population of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, so far as this particular appointment is concerned, while I would rather that the nominee had come from the District of Columbia, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination, because if we reject this nominee the President is not bound to appoint another individual from any particular section of the country. He could even go to Nevada for a nominee, or to Ohio. So there is no point to be gained by turning down the present nominee, because undoubtedly he is well qualified. His whole career shows that he is eminently qualified. So nothing is to be gained by rejecting the nomination.

The point I wish to stress, and that is the reason why I took the floor on this occasion, is that appointees to public office in the District should come from among the population of the District of Columbia.

That is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as soon as Congress reconvenes after the recess about to be taken, I propose to sponsor a measure which will give the people of the District of Columbia the right of self-government, and the right to have officials appointed to office in the District from among the people of the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the case has been presented very ably by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and I am delighted that the distinguished Senators from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are going to join with us in the future when similar appointments are made. The Senator from New Jersey has indicated that he at least is going to ask that full hearings be had on nominations sent to the Senate in the future. The Senators from New Mexico and Nevada have indicated their willingness to support the principle that District men and women should be appointed to occupy District positions.

My objections to this particular appointment, as I indicated the other day, are two. First, because of the procedure followed in the committee, which I thought was railroading through a nomination without proper consideration, when certain members of the committee were not even polled and when all members of the committee had no opportunity to question the fitness of the individual concerned.

Secondly, my position is due to the fact that I think there are in the District of Columbia Negroes competent to fill this office. To that end I asked some of the representative groups in the District if there were outstanding Negroes in the District of Columbia who would make competent recorders of deeds, and they were very enthusiastic about two names which they gave me as being typical of the outstanding Negroes of the District. The names were those of the Honorable

James A. Cobb, who for many years served as municipal court judge in the District of Columbia, and also as an Assistant Attorney General of the United States; and a Mr. John R. Pinkett, who is in the insurance business, and who is a member of the District of Columbia Welfare Commission at the present time. Both men, they said, might be interested in the post, and were eminently qualified to fill it.

For that reason I believe we could well consider at this time, to serve as an administrative officer of the District, a District of Columbia Negro. For the two reasons mentioned I support the motion of the distinguished Senator from Ohio to recommit the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] that the nomination be recommitted.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall cast my personal vote against the confirmation of this nomination, because of the reasons which have been advanced on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, and at an earlier date. However, I feel an obligation to place before the Senate the views of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] with respect to the nomination. The Senator from Pennsylvania makes the following statement for inclusion in the RECORD:

Mr. President, the nomination of Dr. Marshall L. Shepard to be the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia meets with my sincere approval.

I have known Dr. Shepard over the years and I consider him an outstanding and straightforward citizen, as well as a sincere and faithful minister of the gospel. And I know that he is highly respected by the citizens of his community in the great city of Philadelphia.

I believe him to be eminently qualified to fill and properly carry out the position for which he has been designated. Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to confirm his appointment.

I repeat that personally I am unable to yield to the persuasions of my Pennsylvania colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Marshall L. Shepard to be Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard S. Cole to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from May 17, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John T. Guthrie to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from May 17, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert W. McCarty to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from May 21, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold Maurice Kennedy to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSAYER IN THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul S. Nice to be assayer in the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc, and because of the long list, I also ask that the names be not printed in full, but that reference be made to the dates on which the nominations were submitted to the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there seem to be scores of Navy nominations. Will the Senator indicate what they are?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They are routine promotions in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to printing the list of names? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO REFER NOMINATIONS TO APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the able majority leader. We anticipate a message from the White House. If such a message should be received, could the nominations, if there were any in the message, be referred to the appropriate committees by unanimous consent?

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean that he anticipates the receipt of nominations today?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are planning to take a recess until tomorrow. I am sure that by unanimous consent the Senate could authorize the Secretary to refer to the appropriate committees any nominations received. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONOR FLAGS ON V-E-DAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few moments.

For the past 33 months the United Nations have been marching shoulder to shoulder toward victory. Now that they are about to arrive at victory in Europe it is of concern to all of us that they continue to maintain the same solidarity of action and of purpose in peace that they have developed in war. It appears to me that V-E-day, by which we mean victory-in-Europe day, provides a golden opportunity to further strengthen the friendly relations which now exist among the United and Associated Nations. It may well be a time when the people of this Nation can demonstrate to the world their appreciation for what other nations have done to help achieve this first step toward the peace so earnestly desired by this country and those associated with her in a common purpose.

A simple, practical, and in my estimation, a very desirable method of demonstrating this appreciation is now available. It is the two-flag idea—the flying of the national flag in the position of honor, of course, with the United Nations honor flag flying beside or beneath it.

Let America honor her own flag first, but may she not forget on V-E-day that other nations have helped and must continue to help to create and maintain the kind of world for which she stands.

It is at this time when the combined moral, military, material and financial might of the 44 United and Associated Nations is shaping the victory that I make this suggestion as to the way in which I believe the people of the United States should celebrate the momentous occasion. It seems to me that this country should bear in mind on "victory in Europe day" that America did not win the struggle alone, but that she was buttressed by the efforts of many other nations.

I can think of no finer gesture to the world and no finer way for this Nation to cement her friendly relations with

other nations than by demonstrating her appreciation on V-E-day by flying the Stars and Stripes from every building in America and in addition thereto flying the secondary flag which pays honor and respect to all her friends and allies.

For the past 2 years this United Nations honor flag has been developed as a symbol of friendship and cooperation among the peoples dedicated to creating and maintaining the type of world for which our Nation stands. It has made friends for us among other nations. This white flag, with its four upright red bars, is familiar to us in Washington who have seen it flying from the principal private buildings of this capital city and fluttering from the marquees of the downtown theaters for the past year.

The highlights of the development of this flag are interesting, and I take this opportunity of mentioning a few of them. The flag was chosen in 1942 by representatives of all the United Nations in unofficial conversations conducted by Brooks Harding, originator of the two-flag idea. Let it be said to the credit of Mr. Harding that he gave up his own employment and occupation to devote himself exclusively to the development of this symbol. This design and idea was later unanimously approved by leaders and prominent members of more than a score of nationally known patriotic, fraternal, civic, and religious organizations. The new flag was first used to pay honor and respect to the other United Nations when it was introduced by the Department of the District of Columbia American Legion in 1943 Flag Day ceremonies. Under the auspices of the United Nations Club, on June 20, 1943, it was first raised to the top of a flagpole at Dumbarton Oaks, where the United Nations post-war conferences are now being held.

I may add, Mr. President, that I was present on that occasion, I saw the inspiring sight of this symbol of international unity raised, and later was permitted to make a few remarks in the Senate concerning the occasion.

The popular use of the flag was inaugurated in the Nation's Capitol during Atlantic Charter Week, August 14-21, 1943. Since then it has been reported that this flag has been used in many of the United Nations and in the liberated areas. On Memorial Day of this year, the flag was used at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to pay honor and respect to all those of other countries who have sacrificed their lives in common cause with Americans.

Before this 2-flag idea was evolved, 44 flags were required to indicate the United and Associated Nations. Now the 1 flag with the 4 red bars emblazoned on its field of white—which, mind you, always flies secondary to the national emblem—has made it possible for every citizen and every organization throughout this Nation to honor every one of the other United and Associated Nations. It provides a simple way of showing appreciation to other nations without slighting any. It is the symbol of common aspiration among like-minded peoples of the world.

This symbol is not a product of America alone. Since its development in association with all the other United Nations, it has remained the only symbol of solidarity in use among these same nations.

This flag has been found to be acceptable in practice, and its very distinctiveness of design precludes the suggestion of influence by any particular country. Later if it should appear desirable to alter the present design, it could be done. It is not the design, but the idea, that is important. However, the white flag with the four upright red bars has received favorable acceptance to date, and is the one design now available for V-E-day. Let me repeat that unofficially and informally representatives of all the other United Nations have given approval to the present design of our common flag.

Some of you may know this honor flag by its other name—the United Nations flag of four freedoms, as represented by the four upright bars. The "four freedoms," as we all have come to discuss and know them, have been much discussed and variously defined. Among the numerous definitions, there are the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, the "four pillars of freedom," as enunciated by Madam Chiang Kai-shek, and the "four freedoms" suggested by the President. Because of these variations, the symbolism of the four upright bars of the United Nations honor flag remains undefined and open to future interpretations by individual nations or by the whole group of the cooperating countries.

The flag of which I speak is not an official flag, as I have indicated. This body or any similar body in any other nation has not taken formal action upon the two-flag idea. However, such action has not been necessary in order to fly the flag or to make it an effective way by which we can pay honor and respect to all the friends and allies of any one of the United and Associated Nations. Perhaps, as it comes from the hearts of the people and as it becomes popular through their desire to show appreciation to other nations, it may even mean more to the world than if it were to first come by official action.

But regardless of all the virtues of the two-flag idea, I would consider the suggestion that it be flown on V-E-day wholly impractical at this time, if it were not for the fact that the simplicity of design permits it to be easily made in the school or in the home. Any white-and-red material at hand can serve the purpose for this particular day and later these home-made honor flags may be replaced by those of a more permanent nature when proper material or factory-made flags are available. For individuals, schools, or organizations who wish to make this flag, I will state the proportions. The bars are six-tenths as long as the flag is wide, and the width of the bars is one-tenth the length of the flag. The spacing of the bars is equal to the width of the bars, and the bars are placed in the center of the flag. The honor flag is one-half to three-quarters the size of the national emblem

when flown beneath it, and the same size when flown beside it.

When so little effort and expense are involved to honor those who have helped to make victory possible, it is my hope, and I know it is shared by my colleagues, that every citizen of this Nation will display the United Nations honor flag secondarily to the national emblem, beginning on V-E day, and will continue the practice during the years to follow, when friendship and cooperation among all nations will mean so much to the future peace and security of the world.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 20 (legislative day of September 1, 1944):

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

I nominate Walter Thurston, of Arizona, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

John F. Simmons, of New York, a Foreign Service Officer of Class 1 and Counselor of Embassy at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Poland now established in London.

Charles Sawyer, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

Stanley K. Hornbeck, of Colorado, now Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London.

Lithgow Osborne, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Norway now established in London.

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, former Minister to Latvia and Estonia, now assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following named officer for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEON EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 15, 1944

Roy E. Wolfe

The following named officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH

John H. Pritchett, Jr. Arthur Kornberg
John K. McBane Harold B. Alexander
Roland K. Iverson Harry Leaffer

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Henry A. Holle

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1944

Omar C. Hopkins

IN THE NAVY

Capt. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of August 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended:

John H. King, Jr., from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert R. Baker, from the 6th day of September 1941.

Francis H. Smyth, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Jack R. Moore, from the 10th day of October 1941.

Robert T. Whitten, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Thomas H. Mann, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.

Alton W. McCully, from the 1st day of May 1942.

Bernard L. Josephson, from the 22d day of May 1942.

Oscar C. Hauge, Jr., from the 8th day of June 1942.

Henry M. Bourgeois, from the 18th day of June 1942.

John F. Begert, from the 18th day of June 1942.

Arthur R. Boag, from the 19th day of June 1942.

George E. Wasson, from the 25th day of June 1942.

Curtis S. Harrison, from the 11th day of August 1942.

Thomas B. Wood, from the 16th day of October 1942.

Robert "F" Foxworth, from the 1st day of November 1942.

Bobbie G. Bauder, from the 1st day of November 1942.

Technical Sgt. Robert W. Lowe, a meritorious noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1943.

Charles J. Keen, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944:

John R. Jones, a citizen of Virginia.

Howell T. Heflin, a citizen of Alabama.

Hugo A. Oswald, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 20 (legislative day of September 1), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter Thurston to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

John F. Simmons to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to El Salvador.

Arthur Bliss Lane to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the

United States of America to the Government of Poland now established in London.

Charles Sawyer to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxemburg.

Stanley K. Hornbeck to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Netherlands.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Yugoslavia now established in London.

Lithgow Osborne to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of Norway now established in London.

John C. Wiley to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

George Wadsworth to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lebanese Republic and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

H. Coit MacLean
Edward P. Lawton

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Theodore P. Wright to be Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Marshall L. Shepard to be Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE) FROM INDICATED DATES

Howard S. Cole, from May 17, 1944.
John T. Guthrie, from May 17, 1944.
Robert W. McCarty, from May 21, 1944.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold Maurice Kennedy to be United States district judge for eastern district of New York.

ASSAYER IN THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

Paul S. Nice to be Assayer of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Chester P. Smith et al. for appointment in the Navy were confirmed today.

(NOTE.—A full list of all persons whose nominations for appointment in the Navy were confirmed today may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 15, 1944, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Chester P. Smith on page 7818 and ending with the name of Edward G. Cunney, on page 7822.)

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

J. Glenn Bell, Rye.
George R. Simon, Seibert.

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Wilcox, East Granby.
Philip T. Lewis, East Killingly.
Edgar J. Proulx, Goodyear.
William Liberty, Voluntown.

FLORIDA

Alma Nall, Azucar.
Isaac W. West, Chosen.
Sarah J. Burns, Enterprise.
Vivian P. Snyder, Floral City.

Jesse C. Womble, Highland City.
John B. McGill, Lake Helen.
Edward J. Courtoy, Nokomis.

IDAHO

Harold S. Bailey, Grand View.
Clara Hand, Roberts.
Alvin L. Ralphs, Rockland.

KENTUCKY

Mary Lou Harris, Adolphus.
Ruth M. McPherson, Beech Creek.
Romie E. Welsbrodt, Bradford.
Estill Hurt, Bulan.
Raymond C. Morgan, Closplint.
Mollie L. Allphin, Crittenden.
Hollis M. Smith, Fonthill.
Lillian N. Coombs, Graham.
Hattie Koenen, Hanson.
Alice Scott, Hardy.
Dorsey C. Rose, Hazel Green.
Anna O. Stephens, Hi Hat.
Raymond L. Renfrow, Horse Branch.
Willie Hall, McDowell.
Uel S. Morgan, Nebo.
Gertrude Scott, Pinsonfork.
Charles E. Branson, Robards.
Minnie B. Tiller, Rush.
James P. Hudson, St. Charles.
Ruth M. Keck, Sandy Hook.
Roy Dye, Scottsville.
Mossie L. Winters, Twila.
Marion H. Brashear, Viper.
Emma L. Hudson, Wheatcroft.

MICHIGAN

Esther I. Geroux, Bergland.
George A. Wright, Jr., Big Rapids.
Bennett Taylor, Dansville.
Charles N. Stone, Dorr.
Olaf Albin Olson, Gaastra.
William Herschel Miller, Hartford.
Coral Estep, Muir.
Lorene D. Fosket, Pottersville.
Anne M. Polich, West Olive.

MISSOURI

John S. Smith, Williamstown.

MONTANA

Lawrence E. Osness, Huntley.
May M. Beckman, Lame Deer.
Keith Hane, Power.
Wilma Givogre, Wisdom.

NEBRASKA

Vera F. Knickerbocker, Verdon.

NEVADA

Edward D. Gladding, Virginia City.

NEW MEXICO

Mack W. Urioste, Raton.
John F. Lopez, San Juan Pueblo.

OHIO

Inez S. Winget, Edison.

OKLAHOMA

Harvey L. Sanderson, Burbank.
Frederick M. Shaw, Oklahoma City.

PUERTO RICO

Victor M. Monrouzeau, Arecibo.

RHODE ISLAND

Joseph E. Daneault, Albion.
Arthur J. Stokes, Forestdale.
Charlie H. Arnold, Greene.
Charles H. Williams, Kenyon.
Ann A. Dillon, La Fayette.

WISCONSIN

Dorothy J. Steckbauer, Aniwa.
Ethel Y. Hogenson, Chill.
Arthur Nortwen, Conover.
Erna M. Dohm, Dane.
John C. Esse, DeForest.
Nicholas A. Braun, Eden.
Werner W. Wolfinger, Eland.
Emma M. Olson, Mindoro.
Bertha Peterson, Ogdensburg.
Ray L. Truskowski, Sobieski.
Magdalene Grimsrud, Stoddard.
Leo J. Velten, Tony.
John R. Lesar, Willard.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and merciful Father, we bow at Thy altar and ask Thee to open our minds and hearts to Thy holy presence. As each day brings its varied experience do Thou help us to subdue pride and passion and turn to Him who made a path through the night for the morning, and whose sacrifice and example live through the ages. He is our hope, higher than the heavens, broader than the earth, and boundless in its scope.

Almighty God, many minds there are contriving untried and unwise highways for peace and good will, omitting the real solution of life and destiny. Let us hear the word of the Lord: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his life?" Though evil is sweeping its pall over this sad earth, yet the good cannot die; the patriarchs, the prophets, the disciples, and the martyrs, these are royally alive today. We pray Thee to companion us with their spirit and courage and to hold fast the imperiled soul of our country. "Blest with victory and peace, may the heaven-rescued land praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation. Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, and this be our motto, 'In God is our trust'." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5125) entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. General Accounting Office.
8. Selective Service System.
9. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security

Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION"

"SECTION 101. (a) There is hereby established the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which shall be headed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the 'Director'). The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per year, and shall serve for a term of two years.

"(b) The following agencies shall be placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and shall exercise their functions subject to the general supervision of the Director:

"(1) Office of Contract Settlement, created by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

"(2) Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9425 (if such Administration is in existence after the Office of War Mobilization ceases to exist), and the Surplus Property Board created by the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"(3) Retraining and Reemployment Administration, created by Executive Order Numbered 9427 (if such Administration is in existence after the Office of War Mobilization ceases to exist), and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration created by title III of this Act.

"Nothing in this subsection shall imply any derogation of the powers of the Director under subsection (c) with respect to the agencies placed within his office or with respect to other agencies not specifically placed within his office.

"(c) In addition to any powers which the President is authorized to and does delegate to the Director for the purpose of more effectively coordinating the mobilization of the Nation for war, the Director shall, subject to the direction of the President—

"(1) formulate or have formulated such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace;

"(2) issue such orders and regulations to executive agencies as may be necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner consistent with the plans formulated under this section or to coordinate the activities of executive agencies with respect

to the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace. Each executive agency shall carry out the orders and regulations of the Director expeditiously and, to the extent necessary to carry out such orders and regulations, shall modify its operations and procedures and issue regulations with respect thereto. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any activities to carry out any plans formulated under this section which are not within the scope of the powers possessed by the President or the executive agencies under provisions of law other than this section;

"(3) recommend to the Congress appropriate legislation providing authority to carry out plans developed under this section but not authorized under existing law;

"(4) promote and assist in the development of demobilization and reconversion plans by executive agencies; develop procedures whereby each executive agency is kept informed of proposed demobilization and reconversion plans and proposals which relate to its work and which are being developed or carried out by other executive agencies; and settle controversies between executive agencies in the development and administration of such plans;

"(5) cause studies and reports to be made for him by the various executive agencies which will enable him to determine the need for the simplification, consolidation, or elimination of such executive agencies as have been established for the purposes of the war emergency, for the termination, or establishment by statute, of executive agencies which exist under Executive order only, and for the relaxation or removal of emergency war controls;

"(6) institute a specific study, for submission to the President and the Congress, of the present functions of the various executive agencies in the field of manpower, and develop a program for reorganizing and consolidating such agencies to the fullest extent practicable;

"(7) consult and cooperate with State and local governments, industry, labor, agriculture, and other groups, both national and local, concerning the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; and

"(8) submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this Act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment, and may include such legislative proposals as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(d) The Director shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such Deputy Directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services, as may be necessary to carry out his functions. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Deputy Directors and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Director shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies; and for that purpose only he is authorized to delegate to the appropriate agencies and provide for the redelegation of the powers and duties vested in him, except the power to issue orders and regulations to other executive agencies. The Director may require such reports and information from executive agencies as he deems necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this Act, and each executive agency shall

furnish any information and reports so required.

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall consist of twelve members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of the Board shall represent the general public and the public interest, but in order that the Board may have the benefit of experience in the matters with which it will deal under this Act, three members of the Board shall have had experience in business management, three members shall have had experience in matters relating to labor, and three members shall have had experience in agriculture. The President shall designate one of the remaining three members as chairman of the Board.

"(b) It shall be the general function of the Board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion and make to him such recommendations relating to legislation, policies, and procedures as it may deem necessary.

"(c) Members of the Board shall receive a per diem allowance of \$25 for each day spent in actual meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Director, plus necessary traveling and other expenses incurred while so engaged.

"TITLE II—DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION POLICIES"

"SEC. 201. The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

"SEC. 202. Any contracting agency shall terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of the agency the performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not continue performance under such contracts merely for the purpose of providing business and employment, or for any purposes other than the prosecution of the war, unless the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion finds that the continuation of some or all of the work in process under any such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial physical injury to a plant or property.

"SEC. 203. Curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts shall be integrated and synchronized with the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for other war purposes, and, to the greatest extent compatible with the effective prosecution of the war, of production for nonwar use. To effectuate this policy—

"(a) the contracting agencies shall continuously survey their product and material requirements and report to the Director, in such form and detail as he may determine, on current and anticipated changes in requirements and on all anticipated curtailments of war production or terminations of war contracts;

"(b) the executive agencies exercising control over manpower, production, or materials shall permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use whenever such production does not require materials, components, facilities, or labor needed for war purposes, or will not otherwise adversely affect or interfere with the production for war purposes. Such production for nonwar use shall be permitted regardless of whether one or more competitors normally engaged in the same type of production are still engaged in the performance under any contract which is needed for the prosecution of the war, and shall not be made dependent upon the existence of a concern or the functioning of a concern in a given field of activity at a given time;

"(c) the Director shall—

"(1) establish policies to be followed by the contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts or classes of contracts for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination;

"(2) establish policies providing for full and prompt consultation between the executive agencies, war contractors, and the representatives of the employees of war contractors with regard to obtaining the most effective use in other war production or in production for nonwar use of facilities and manpower to be released through anticipated curtailments in war production or terminations of war contracts.

"Sec. 204. (a) Whenever the expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use is authorized, on a restricted basis, by any executive agency having control over manpower, production, or materials, the restrictions imposed shall not be such as to prevent any small plant capable and desirous of participating in such expansion, resumption, or initiation of production for nonwar use from so participating in such production.

"(b) Whenever such executive agency allocates available materials for the production of any item or group of items for nonwar use, it shall make available a percentage of such materials for the exclusive use by small plants for the production of such item or group of items. Such percentage shall be determined by the head of such agency after giving full consideration to the claims presented by the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and shall be fair and equitable.

"(c) In allocating the materials thus set aside among such small plants, such executive agency shall establish criteria, standards, quotas, schedules, or other conditioning factors after consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such executive agency shall allocate such materials directly to such small plants and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, provide for making such allocations through local offices easily accessible to such small plants. For the purposes of this title, a small plant means any small business concern engaged primarily in production or manufacturing either employing two hundred and fifty wage earners or less, or coming within such other categories as may be established by the head of such executive agency in consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Such other categories shall be defined by taking into consideration the comparative sizes of establishments in a particular industry as reflected by sales volumes, quantities of materials consumed, capital investments, or by other criteria which are reasonably attributable to small plants rather than medium or large size plants.

"Sec. 205. The Attorney General is directed to make surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of war mobilization and during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter. The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress within ninety days after the approval of this Act, and at such times thereafter as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including recommendations for such legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"TITLE III—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

"Sec. 301. There is hereby established a Retraining and Reemployment Administration (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administration'), the functions of which, subject to the general supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, shall be exercised by a Retraining and Reemployment Administrator (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administrator'), to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to

receive a salary at the rate of \$12,000 per annum. The same person may serve as Administrator and as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but in such case he shall receive only the salary provided by this section.

"Sec. 302. It shall be the function of the Administration—

"(a) to have general supervision and direction of the activities of all existing executive agencies (except the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs) authorized by law relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating such activities and eliminating overlapping functions of such agencies. To the extent necessary to achieve such purposes the Administrator shall have power to issue regulations in connection with the work of such executive agencies, but nothing in this title shall be deemed to confer any power or authority upon any such agency or authorize any activities by any such agency not authorized by provisions of law other than this title, or to extend any existing power beyond the date upon which it would otherwise expire; and

"(b) to confer with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating the activities of existing Federal agencies with the activities of such State and local agencies.

"Sec. 303. The Administrator shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such Assistant Administrators and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions and the functions of the Administration. All such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that Assistant Administrators and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. To the fullest extent practicable, the Administrator shall perform the duties imposed upon him through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies.

"TITLE IV—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"Sec. 401. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence of the subsection, a comma and the following: 'or deposited pursuant to appropriations to the Federal unemployment account.'

"(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting, after the words 'a separate book account for each State agency' a comma and the following: 'the Federal unemployment account.'

"(c) Section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding, at the end of the section, the following new subsections:

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, to make transfers from the Federal unemployment account to the account of any State in the Unemployment Trust Fund in accordance with certification made by the Board pursuant to section 1201, not exceeding the amount on deposit in the Federal unemployment account at the time of such transfer.

"(h) There is hereby established in the Unemployment Trust Fund a Federal unemployment account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account a sum equal to the excess of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943,

under title IX of this Act and under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, over the total unemployment administrative expenditures made prior to July 1, 1943; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such account for the fiscal year 1945 and for each fiscal year thereafter (1) a sum equal to any excess of taxes collected in the preceding fiscal year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act over the unemployment administrative expenditures made in such year, and (2) such further sums, if any, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of title XII. Any amounts in the Federal unemployment account on October 1, 1947, and any amounts repaid to such account after such date, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. As used in this subsection, the term "unemployment administrative expenditures" means expenditures for grants under title III of this Act, for the administration of that title by the Board, and for the administration of title IX of this Act and of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act by the Department of the Treasury and the Board. For the purposes of this subsection there shall be deducted from the total amount of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this Act, the sum of \$40,561,886.43 which was authorized to be appropriated by the Act of August 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 754).

"Sec. 402. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XII—ADVANCES TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"Sec. 1201. (a) In the event that the balance in a State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund on June 30, 1945, or on the last day in any ensuing calendar quarter which ends prior to July 1, 1947, does not exceed a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher, the State shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) hereof, to have transferred from the Federal unemployment account to its account in the Unemployment Trust Fund an amount equal to the amount by which the unemployment compensation paid out by it in the calendar quarter ending on such day exceeded 2.7 per centum of the total remuneration which was paid during such quarter and was subject to the State unemployment compensation law.

"(b) The Social Security Board is authorized and directed, on application of a State unemployment compensation agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions for the transfer of moneys provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions exist, the Board is directed to certify, to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts for transfer in order to carry out the purposes of this title, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Board finds that the amounts transferred for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise, concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Board deems necessary or relevant to the performance of its duties hereunder.

"(c) Any amount transferred to the account of any State under this section shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the unemployment fund of such State and shall be repaid to the Federal unemployment account from the unemployment fund of that State to the extent that the balance in the State's account in the Unem-

employment Trust Fund, at the end of any calendar quarter, exceeds a sum equal to the total contributions deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund under the unemployment compensation law of the State during that one of the two calendar years next preceding such day in which such deposits were higher. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, after the end of each calendar quarter, transfer from the unemployment account of each State in the Unemployment Trust Fund to the Federal unemployment account the amount required to be repaid from the unemployment fund of such State at the end of such quarter under this subsection."

"TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS

"Sec. 501. (a) In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as 'public agencies') to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

"(b) Funds appropriated for the making of loans or advances hereunder shall be allotted by the Federal Works Administrator among the several States in the following proportion: 90 per centum in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census, and 10 per centum according to his discretion: *Provided*, That the allotments to any State shall aggregate not less than one-half of 1 per centum of the total funds available for allotment hereunder: *Provided further*, That no loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all State, local, or regional plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority.

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken. Any sums so repaid shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 601. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'executive agency' means any department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States.

"(b) The term 'contracting agency' means any Government agency which has been or hereafter may be authorized to make contracts pursuant to section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any corporation organized pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (47 Stat. 5), as amended, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

"Sec. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 603. The provisions of this Act shall terminate on June 30, 1947.

"Sec. 604. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 605. (a) When the Director first appointed under section 101 has taken office, the Office of War Mobilization established by Executive Order Numbered 9347, dated May 27, 1943, not including the Surplus War Property Administration or the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Office of War Mobilization, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

"(b) When a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Board first appointed under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 have taken office, the Surplus War Property Administration created by Executive Order Numbered 9425 shall cease to exist; and such records and office equipment of the Surplus War Property Administration, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Surplus Property Board.

"(c) When the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator first appointed under section 301 has taken office, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration created by Executive Order Numbered 9427, shall cease to exist; and such records and property of the Administration created by such Executive order, and such unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds available for its use, as the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Retraining and Reemployment Administration established by this Act.

"Sec. 606. All orders, policies, procedures, or directives prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization, in effect upon the effective date of this Act, and not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by the Director in accordance with this Act, or by operation of law.

"Sec. 607. This Act may be cited as the 'War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.'

And the House agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
HAROLD KNUSTON,
DANIEL A. REED,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,

Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALLEN W. BARKLEY,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
ROBERT A. TAFT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2051) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

When the House passed this bill, it struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted, in lieu thereof, an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This statement indicates the respects in which there were substantial differences be-

tween the Senate bill and the House amendment and the action recommended by the conferees with respect thereto.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Section 101 of the Senate bill contained a declaration of the objectives of the act. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 102 of the Senate bill contained the provisions establishing the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and prescribing the powers and duties of that Office. The comparable provisions in the House amendment were in section 101. While most of the provisions in these sections were identical in the Senate bill and the House amendment, there were some substantial differences.

The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, providing that the agencies which were placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion should exercise their functions subject to the general supervision of the Director of that Office. The conference agreement retains this provision. The Senate bill included the Retraining and Reemployment Administration among the agencies placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The House amendment omitted this provision, as the House amendment terminated the existence of that Administration. The conference agreement restores this provision with technical changes.

The House amendment omitted from this section the provisions of the Senate bill which specifically authorized the Director to issue directives to the executive agencies and required such agencies to comply with such directives. The conference agreement authorizes the Director to issue regulations and orders, rather than directives, to the executive agencies and requires such agencies to comply with such regulations and orders. The conference agreement also makes clarifying changes in the language of this section for the purpose of indicating that the agencies within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as well as the agencies outside of that Office, are to be subject to the authority vested in the Director by subsection (c) of this section.

The House amendment made a clarifying change in the provision of subsection (d) of this section, relating to the employment of personnel and the making of expenditures, for the purpose of indicating that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is to employ only such personnel and to make only such expenditures as may be necessary for carrying out the functions vested in him and is not to employ the personnel and make the expenditures necessary for carrying out the functions of the other agencies placed within his office. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect. The House amendment omitted a provision of the Senate bill which would authorize the Director to employ expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws. The conference agreement restores this provision. The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, providing for the delegation of the powers and duties vested in the Director. The conference agreement retains this provision, but provides that the power to issue regulations and orders to executive agencies may not be so delegated.

Section 103 of the Senate bill and section 102 of the House amendment, respectively, created an advisory board to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion. The principal difference between the Senate and the House provisions was that the membership of the board, under

the Senate provision, was to include representatives of different economic groups, while, under the House provision, all of the members of the board were to represent the general public and the public interest, but its membership was to include persons with experience in different economic fields. This section in the conference agreement follows the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 104 of the Senate bill established a Joint Congressional Committee on Post-war Adjustment. The House amendment contained no such provision. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

TITLE II—DEMILITARIZATION AND RECONVERSION POLICIES

Section 201 in the Senate bill and in the House amendment provided that the contracting agencies should terminate prime contracts for war production whenever in the opinion of such agencies performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war. The section also provided that performance under such terminated contracts should not be continued merely for the purpose of providing business and employment or for any other purposes other than the prosecution of the war; except that in the Senate bill the section contained a provision which was not in the House amendment and which would permit the continuation of some or all of the work under any such contract if it would benefit the Government or if it should be necessary to avoid substantial injury to a plant or property. The conference agreement retains this provision of the Senate bill in a modified form which provides that performance shall not be continued under such contracts for any purpose other than the prosecution of the war, unless the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion finds that the continuation of some or all of the work in process under any such contract will benefit the Government or is necessary to avoid substantial physical injury to a plant or property.

Section 203 (b) of the Senate bill created a board of appeals to hear and act upon the complaints of persons aggrieved by the action of Government agencies in allocating scarce materials for production for nonwar use. The House amendment contained no such provision, but it did contain (sec. 203 (b) and (c)) provisions requiring that whenever materials are allocated for production for nonwar use, a percentage of such materials should be made available for exclusive use by small plants. The percentage to be set aside among small plants and the manner of allocating materials among such small plants, was to be determined after consultation with the chairman of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

TITLE III—RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT

The House amendment omitted all of the provisions of title III of the Senate bill. The nature of these provisions and the conference action with respect to them is as follows:

Section 301 of the Senate bill established a Retraining and Reemployment Administration, the functions of which, subject to the general supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, were to be exercised by an Administrator, to be appointed by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and to receive a salary of \$12,000 a year. The conference agreement retains this section, but provides that the Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, rather than by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The conference agreement also provides that the same person may serve as the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator and as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 302 of the Senate bill provided that it should be the function of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, with the assistance of a board composed of representatives of various executive agencies, to have general supervision and direction of the activities of all Government agencies relating to the retraining and reemployment of persons released from war work, and to develop plans and programs relating to such retraining and reemployment. Section 302 of the conference agreement contains the provisions prescribing the functions of this Administration. The section omits the policy board which would have been established under the Senate bill and provides that it shall be the function of the Administration to have general supervision and direction of the activities which existing executive agencies (except the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs) are authorized by law to carry out with respect to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, for the purpose of coordinating such activities and eliminating overlapping functions of such agencies. The purpose of the section is to provide for the coordination of the activities of Government agencies in this field, and the section expressly provides that this title shall not be deemed to authorize any additional activities by the executive agencies whose activities are to be coordinated by the Administrator. The section also makes it the function of the Administration to confer with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating the activities of Federal agencies with the activities of such State and local agencies.

Section 303 of the Senate bill provided that the Administrator should have power to provide transportation, at a cost not exceeding \$200 in any one case, for war workers from the place of their employment to the location of their bona fide residence or to the location of new employment arranged by the worker. The conference agreement omits this provision.

Section 304 of the Senate bill provided that the War and Navy Departments should discharge persons from the armed forces as rapidly as it was determined that their services were no longer needed for the prosecution of the war or for the national defense, and should not retain such persons in the armed forces merely for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment. A modified form of this provision is retained as section 201 of the conference agreement, which provides that the War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in service in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

Section 305 of the Senate bill provided that the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator should confer with Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of programs relating to vocational education and rehabilitation, training in industry, and other similar programs, and secure the expansion of such programs when and if necessary. If he found that such expansion could not be secured, or could be secured only by additional Federal legislation or assistance, he was to recommend to Congress such legislation as he considered necessary. These provisions are omitted from the conference agreement; however, as indicated above, section 302 of the conference agreement contains provisions relating to consultation with State and local agencies.

Section 306 of the Senate bill authorized the Administrator to employ personnel and make expenditures for the purpose of car-

rying out his powers and duties, and provided that, to the fullest extent practicable, he should perform his duties through the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies. The provisions of this section are retained as section 303 of the conference agreement.

TITLE IV—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROVISIONS

Section 401 of the Senate bill amended the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment in the unemployment trust fund of a Federal unemployment account, and authorized the appropriation to such account of sums necessary to carry out the unemployment compensation provisions of this bill. The provisions of section 301 of the House amendment were substantially the same, except that the amendment made by this section in the House amendment contained a provision, similar to one of the provisions of section 404 of the Senate bill, providing that any amounts remaining in the Federal unemployment account upon the termination of the effective period of this act and any amounts thereafter repaid to such account should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. The conference agreement (sec. 401) follows the House amendment in this respect, except that it provides that these moneys are not to be covered into the general fund of the Treasury until after September 30, 1947.

Section 402 in the Senate bill and section 302 in the House amendment, respectively, amended the Social Security Act to provide for advances to State unemployment funds for the purpose of preventing the exhaustion of such funds in the event of heavy demands upon them by reason of widespread unemployment during the reconversion period. The House amendment made no substantial changes in this section of the Senate bill, however, it did make a number of clarifying and technical changes for the purpose of facilitating its administration. The conference agreement (sec. 402) follows this section of the House amendment with a change which, in conformity with the action fixing June 30, 1947, as the termination date for other provisions of the act, provides that the period for which such advances may be made shall end on June 30, 1947, and with other minor clerical changes.

Section 403 of the Senate bill amended the Social Security Act by adding at the end thereof a new title providing for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. Under the Senate bill such compensation would have been payable for unemployment occurring after September 30, 1944, and prior to the end of the second full calendar year after the termination of hostilities in the present war. The compensation payable to Federal employees would be in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as though the State unemployment compensation laws of the States in which their service in the employ of the Federal Government was performed were applicable to such service. The Senate bill provided for making agreements with the States under which the unemployment compensation payments would be administered by State agencies, but the entire cost of such payments was to be borne by the Federal Government. The House amendment contained no provisions relating to unemployment compensation for Federal employees. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 404 of the Senate bill provided that this act and the amendments to the Social Security Act made thereby should cease to be effective at the end of the second full calendar year after the termination of hostilities in the present war, except that the obligation of State unemployment compensation agencies to repay advances made to sustain their State unemployment compensation

funds should remain effective until such advances were repaid. This provision, as such, was not in the House amendment and is not contained in the conference agreement. A general termination date for the act is contained in section 603 of the conference agreement. No termination date is provided for the amendments made to the Social Security Act because the period during which advances may be made to the States under such amendments is limited in the amendments themselves. Since no termination date is provided for these amendments, the obligation of the States to repay advances made to them will, of course, be a continuing one. This section of the Senate bill also provided that amounts in the Federal unemployment account upon the expiration of the time when advances might be made to State unemployment funds, and any amounts thereafter repaid to the Federal unemployment account, should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury. A similar provision was contained in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by section 301 of the House amendment and is retained in the conference agreement (section 401).

TITLE V—PUBLIC WORKS

Section 501 of the Senate bill and section 401 of the House amendment, respectively, contained provisions authorizing advances or loans to non-Federal public agencies to encourage advance planning for public works. The principal difference between the Senate and House provisions related to interest on such loans or advances and the time of repayment. Under the Senate bill advances under this section were to be without interest and were to be repaid only if and when construction of the public works which had been planned with the advance was undertaken. Under the House amendment, the loans or advances would bear interest at the rate of 2½ percent a year and were required to be repaid within 5 years or, if construction was undertaken before the end of 5 years, to be repaid when construction was undertaken. The conference agreement follows the Senate bill in this respect.

The House amendment provided that loans or advances under this section should be available to public agencies in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, which were not included in the Senate bill. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 502 of the Senate bill provided that the Secretary of Labor should make a study and investigation and a report to Congress with respect to annual wage systems. The House amendment and the conference agreement omit this provision.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 603 of the Senate bill provided that the provisions of the act should be terminated at the end of 24 months after the termination of hostilities. Section 503 of the House amendment provided that the provisions of the act should terminate at the end of 1 year after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or at such earlier time as the Senate and the House shall have passed resolutions declaring that no emergency exists which requires the further continuance of the provisions of the act. The conference agreement (sec. 603) provides that the act shall terminate on June 30, 1947. This section, of course, is not applicable to the amendments to the Social Security Act which are made by this act, as those amendments will be provisions of the Social Security Act and contain within themselves provisions limiting their effective period.

Section 605 of the Senate bill provided that the Office of War Mobilization, established by Executive Order No. 9347, should cease to exist when the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion first appointed under this act had taken office. The comparable pro-

vision of the House amendment (sec. 505) also provided that the Surplus War Property Administration and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, which were created within the Office of War Mobilization by subsequent Executive orders, should cease to exist at the same time. The conference agreement contains separate provisions for terminating the existence of the Office of War Mobilization, the Surplus War Property Administration, and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, respectively. Section 605 (a) provides that the Office of War Mobilization, not including the two Administrations referred to above, shall cease to exist when the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion has taken office. Section 605 (b) provides that the Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive order shall cease to exist when a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Board have taken office pursuant to appointment under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which is now under consideration by the Congress. Section 605 (c) provides that the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, created by Executive order, shall cease to exist when the Retraining and Reemployment Administrator appointed under this act has taken office. In each case the President is authorized to transfer records and property and unexpended funds from the Executive-order agency to the successor agency created by statute.

Section 607 of the Senate bill provided that no alien should be employed in the administration of this act unless he had served honorably in the armed forces of the United States. The House amendment contained no comparable provision, and this provision is omitted from the conference agreement.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REID,
ROY O. WOODRUFF,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an address I expect to deliver on September 25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the conferees met yesterday to consider the matters in disagreement with the Senate, namely, the matter of transportation for war workers and Federal employees, and unemployment compensation for Federal employees. In view of the action taken by the House on last Monday, the Senate conferees receded on these two provisions. The statement, which has just been read, explains the provisions more fully than I could in a short time. Unless some information is desired at this point, I do not see that it is necessary to make any further statement about the matter.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed this legislation it contained a provision that the employees, with the exception of assistant administrators, should be selected or secured through the classified civil service. I note in the report that the employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that deputy directors and expert administrative, technical, and professional personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws. I think someone has stated that an expert is an individual working away from home.

I wonder if the chairman could advise us what this word "expert" means and what group of individuals it will include that will not be under civil service.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We thought there would be a few to be called in from time to time who would not be regular employees. We felt that the Administrator in charge of enforcing the act would have knowledge about whom to call in as experts who could furnish him information that would be helpful. We considered that it would not be necessary to cover that class of people under civil service. But all regular employees, of course, are included under civil service. The Administrator of this act should, of course, have some latitude and discretion in matters of this kind. It cannot be fully outlined and restricted in the legislation.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The same language for selection of employees is also included in title III, retraining and reemployment. I believe the provision for the selection of employees is too wide open and not in accord with what we want to do. Personally I would want to try to restrict this as much as possible to the classified civil service and at least not leave it wide open to what you might call strictly political appointments. Let us not make a political football out of this agency.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think the gentleman may rest assured that that will not be done.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. That was the intention of the committee, was it not? To restrict it as much as possible. That is the way it should be construed by those administering the act.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct; and I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry I was not here when the gentleman started his statement. I should like to ask: Does the gentleman expect to outline all the changes that were made since the House passed on the bill a few days ago?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The statement just read outlined and explained the changes in full. I do not believe it is necessary to repeat that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In my opinion, as the gentleman knows, this measure does not go nearly far enough. I have very carefully read the conference report. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to say that, in my opinion, the bill as it comes to us now is better than it was when it passed this body a few weeks ago. In its present form I think it will do some good and certainly it can do no harm. I hope the membership will see fit to support it unanimously.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That corroborates the statement I made when the conferees asked for instructions; that the House conferees were always ready, willing, and anxious to agree to any compromise or adjustment they believed was not in conflict with the action of the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania make the statement he did. I am furthermore pleased to be informed that the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has assured some Members who are interested in the workers and in the legislation that has been stricken out in sections 2 and 3, that shortly, as soon as conditions permit, those matters will be given careful consideration by his committee. Do I understand it correctly?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did state in my remarks on last Monday that in view of the limited time at the disposal of the committee, and in view also of the honest difference of opinion of some Members of the House, that it would be my purpose at the first practical time to call the committee together to consider further these two questions in dispute, one with respect to transportation and travel pay and the other with respect to unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

Mr. SABATH. I was greatly interested in both these matters and I am indeed grateful that the chairman has made this statement, because this bill, with all due respect to those who spon-

sored it, appears to take care of property rights and interests and does not provide relief and assistance to the several millions of war workers who have rendered efficient and honorable service to our war effort and made it possible to abundantly supply our armed forces with the necessary war materials in the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I assure the gentleman the subject is not finally dropped and that it will get further consideration, such consideration as our committee may deem justified.

Mr. SABATH. I realize that you as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means have your trials and tribulations and that you cannot control the Republicans who are opposed to such relief.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Or the Democrats either.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I concede there may be a few Democrats, but I feel that you will succeed in having your committee report this necessary and needed legislation and assure you of my earnest cooperation until such time when it is enacted.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Executive Order No. 9427 was issued by the President on February 24 of this year, under the provisions of which authority was granted for the retraining of war workers in war industries. Will the gentleman kindly advise the House whether there is any provision in section 101 in reference to the Retraining and Reemployment Administration concerning the retraining of war workers? I understand, of course, that provision is made for the retraining of veterans, but I should like to know if there is anything in this conference report that refers to retraining of war workers?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Nothing new on that. The only provision here is for the purpose of coordination. There is nothing new as far as any retraining is concerned.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What is the status of the authority granted under Executive order of the President No. 9427 when this legislation is enacted? What will be the status of that Executive order?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is terminated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow at the con-

clusion of any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

FEEES AND COSTS IN CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1569) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes, approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543)," with Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after "appeals" insert "and in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that relates to the costs to be charged and collected in each of the circuit courts of appeals in the United States. Mr. Chief Justice Groner of the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals wished it amended so as to name that court specifically. That amendment was adopted in the Senate. The request now being made is that the bill may be taken from the Speaker's table and that the House concur in that Senate amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand it, the only thing it does is to make clear that the District of Columbia is treated the same as the other district and circuit courts of appeals?

Mr. HOBBS. That is all, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report providing for the establishment of a Surplus Property

Board has been finally approved. The conference agreement provides for a board consisting of a chairman and two members to be appointed by the President. Following a tentative agreement for an administrator and a board of four members, all to be under the supervision of the Director of War Mobilization, wholly unworkable in the view of the House majority conferees, Mr. W. L. Clayton, the very able, capable, and courageous Surplus Property Administrator, advised the conferees that the said tentative, hybrid board-administrator was unworkable and that he would neither be an applicant nor would he accept the position of Administrator if offered to him. Subsequently, upon the proposal of the House majority conferees, the Board, consisting of a chairman and two members, with the qualifications and with the duties and authority of the Administrator in the language of the House bill providing for an administrator, was agreed to by the conference and is embodied in the conference agreement. The Board takes the place of the Administrator in the House bill. The Chairman of the Board would take the place of the Administrator as contemplated by the House bill with the approval of at least one of the two other members. There was universal regret when Mr. Clayton, who has been acting as Administrator with outstanding success, announced he would not continue. I believe I express the unanimous sentiment of the Congress when I say that the provision for a board composed of three members was not intended, nor does it reflect upon the administration of Mr. Clayton or upon him personally. I further believe I express the sentiment of the Congress and of the country when I say I trust that inasmuch as the unworkable hybrid board-administrator monstrosity was eliminated in conference he will reconsider and accept the appointment as Chairman of the Surplus Property Board.

WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I spoke on the subject of Axis war prisoners and Axis war criminals. I notice from the press, and from numerous articles I have had time to read, that the United Nations War Crimes Commission after 11 months has been able to discover only 350 war criminals, when everybody in civilization knows that Hitler's Gestapo and most of his officers are all war criminals. In the list of 350 discovered by that Commission—constituted how, I do not know—they never sought to name one of the higher-ups in the German armed forces. I think war criminals are criminals, whether they include lieutenant generals, major generals, or buck privates. Murder is murder whether committed by a field marshal or buck private and ought to be dealt with accordingly, and I now call upon the Allied Nations to see to it that the guilty are

brought to justice. The cruel and merciless slaughter of defenseless men, women, and children by German militarists has shocked the conscience of all mankind.

RE: THE PUNISHMENT OF NAZI FASCIST WAR CRIMINALS

Every prisoner of war should be examined to ascertain if any of them took part in the atrocities and persecution of minority groups, regardless of their race or religion, whether they be Protestant, Catholic, or Jew.

According to the United Nations War Crimes Commission, after 11 months of activity, the Commission's actual list of war criminals consists today of about 350 names. Among the arch criminals so far totally omitted from the list are Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebbels, Robert Ley, Wilhelm Frick, and Fritz Saukel.

Because of legal objections raised particularly by British and Norwegian members, the commission has failed to agree on any punishment for Nazis and other Axis citizens for persecuting or butchering Jews, unless they happen to be of Allied nationality or the crimes were committed on Allied soil. Some semi-official estimates put the number of war criminals to be dealt with at hundreds of thousands. At least one Allied government assessed the total at 6,000,000 including 1,500,000 Gestapo and SS men and 4,500,000 SA militia. The same government emphasized that, besides their guilt for past misdeeds, it is these same men that provide the greatest potential force and manpower reserve for a Nazi military rebirth.

Even the meager attainments of the commission are made largely meaningless by Russia's absence from membership. While all the British Dominions have fortunately escaped enemy occupation and have representatives on the commission, Russia has no one on this same commission. The Russians have their own ideas and plans. They contemplate the coralling of up to 4,000,000 Germans as forced laborers to repair the destruction inflicted on the Soviet Union. The German groups especially identified with war crimes will perhaps enjoy preference.

Millions of people, especially in the countries that Hitler victimized, would fail to understand why he should be treated in accordance with lofty political decisions, while lesser scoundrels come before criminal courts or other Allied tribunals. Some declaration, unless amended, ties the commission's hands in dealing with Nazi exterminators of the Jews. The legal basis of the commission's work now bars punishment of Nazis for maltreating and slaughtering of the Jews of Germany or of other Axis nationality, stateless persons, or German-Jewish citizens of Polish, Czech, French, or other Allied origin.

The Hague convention defines a war crime as an offense by one belligerent against the army or citizenry of another belligerent. Herbert Pell, the American delegate to the commission, proposed as a solution that the commission include among war crimes all offenses against the persons because of race, religion, or political beliefs, irrespective of the victim's nationality or the territory on

which the crimes were committed. A subcommittee adopted Pell's suggestion, but on the commission itself, the British and Norwegian jurists solemnly announced that governments really ought to be asked to grant the commission greater powers to deal with such questions before anything is done about it.

As affairs now stand, the commission would ignore the instigators or actual murderers of many of the two or three million Jews who met death at Nazi hands. Similarly, the commission would refrain from touching the Germans who jailed, tortured, and killed Gentile anti-Nazis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, in regard to the disposition of surplus property and loans less than \$10,000 to small business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject entitled "How About Dan Tobin?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an article by Lou Gardner, of Des Moines, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Federal Works Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to

include an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today. I now ask unanimous consent that that time may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

LABOR AND DEMOCRACY IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, working men and women of the Americas today face an extraordinary political opportunity at a time of world crisis. They can see to it that the United Nations win the peace. Labor has achieved the enormous war production which insures victory. Labor's immense war contribution was praised by our Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and other administration leaders on Labor Day. Labor's chance to help win world peace has been made possible by the Roosevelt administration, which has done more than any other in United States history to give working men and women their rightful role in national affairs. The President and Secretary of State Hull by creating hemisphere cooperation and understanding through the Good Neighbor policy have likewise done more than any previous administration to permit the participation of workers and the common people of Latin America in hemisphere and world affairs.

I would like to review some of the accomplishments of the Roosevelt admin-

istration in strengthening labor and democracy in the Americas and to suggest what further needs to be done. This is a topic which concerns laboring men and women of my city of Tacoma, of the Evergreen State of Washington, and of the continent. Labor unions of my State and of the Nation have a vital stake in whether the Democratic Party and the Roosevelt administration continue in office as the bulwark of labor and democratic progress in the Americas.

LABOR FEARS A REPUBLICAN VICTORY

Latin-American labor is even more fearful of a possible Republican victory than is North American labor. Bitter past experience has shown workers in both halves of the hemisphere what to expect when Wall Street and reactionaries run this country. Certain Republican statesmen, despite all the explanations of alleged G. O. P. good intentions, have alarmed labor and liberals in Latin America and the United States. Republican promises to respect and continue the Good Neighbor policy of Mr. Roosevelt do not impress our southern neighbors.

President Roosevelt enjoys as tremendous popularity in Latin America as among North American workers. Hemisphere labor regards the President as the world's foremost defender of democracy and as the most dynamic of the statesmen leading the United Nations to victory. Our Commander in Chief is admired by more Latin Americans than any other foreigner in history.

It is impossible to imagine a Republican First Lady contributing even a fraction as much in the next 4 years to inter-American understanding as Mrs. Roosevelt. She has devoted much of her extraordinary charm and constructive energy to making a success of such gatherings as the 1944 sessions of the Inter-American Commission of Women.

The foremost Latin-American labor leader, Vicente Lombardo Toledano, of Mexico, head of the Latin-American Confederation of Labor, voiced the fears of all workers. He is afraid that a Republican triumph would seriously menace cordial continental relations, since the Republican Party contains so many Wall Street imperialists anxious to exploit hemisphere labor. By contrast, declares Lombardo Toledano, the Democratic Party represents "a progressive force favoring fulfillment of the Atlantic Charter and guaranties of world democracy and aid to weaker nations." The Mexican leader considers Roosevelt, because of his brilliant war record, to be "a great spokesman for world democracy."

REPUBLICANS ENTRENCHED IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Republican-minded reactionaries entrenched in our Department of State have sabotaged the efforts of new dealers to create an effective inter-American labor program. These gentlemen have blocked or whittled down projects for strengthening hemisphere labor ties like my proposal for the publication of a Who's Who in Latin-American Labor. These foes of labor are a type of bureaucrat that dominates the entire

Federal Government during G. O. P. regimes, as Latin America well knows. They have been termed nineteenth-century tory types by Fortune editor Joseph M. Jones in his little book, *A Modern Foreign Policy for the United States*. Similar criticism of betrayers in the State Department of Roosevelt's ideals is contained in Irving Brant's book, *Road to Peace and Freedom*.

Republicans and reactionaries in the all-powerful State Department have seriously undermined the Good Neighbor policy. Hubert Herring, the distinguished writer, and head of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, wrote in the July Inter-American as follows:

We have spent millions in the effort to persuade Latin America that we must travel together. We have sent some thousands of diplomats and every breed of experts under the sun to South America. Our embassies have bulged with busy people. I could count on my toes, however, the names of those who in any effective fashion have lifted their voices for a vital union of the free peoples of the Americas.

Mr. Herring, while denouncing State Department failure to practice the preachments of Roosevelt and Vice President WALLACE, likewise assails our diplomacy for bolstering dictators in power. He says our tory ambassadors are never known to cultivate Latin-American progressives, labor leaders, and other contributors to the victory over world fascism. An exception is Ambassador Bowers in Chile. I criticized the sending of the wrong kind of diplomat, expert and good-willer to Latin America in a statement appearing in the hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations in June 1941.

If the President allows Mr. Hull to retire full of honors, one of the most respected men in the administration, hemisphere labor would rejoice to see appointed to the fourth term cabinet men like Henry Wallace, Wendell Willkie, or John Winant, long head of the International Labor Office and a leading Republican liberal, now ambassador in London. These men would know how to handle appeasers of Franco and of Latin-American tyrants and the inside saboteurs of labor relations between the Americas.

UNHEEDED WARNING TO STATE DEPARTMENT

For several years before Pearl Harbor I urged an embargo on scrap metal and other materials now being used by Japan to kill our young men. Many unions did likewise. Eight months before Pearl Harbor I urged our complacent Department of State to abandon its diplomacy of expediency and warned lest the Axis prepare unpleasant surprises for which we are not forewarned and well prepared. But my warning of March 25, 1941, went unheeded. Now I warn the Department again to cease appeasing dictatorships in Spain and Latin America and to create a pro-labor and pro-democratic foreign policy.

LABOR DIVISION IN STATE DEPARTMENT

The Department of State, despite the departure of Sumner Welles and the liberal Laurence Duggan—both highly esteemed in Latin America—is at last do-

ing something about labor and social welfare, although not nearly enough. Since my speeches in Congress of early 1941, I have been asking for such activities. The Labor Relations Division was created on January 15, 1944, and labor attachés have been sent to three of the most industrialized countries—Brazil, Chile, and Mexico.

I understand that Mr. Edward Rowell has been sent to Rio, and that he rendered excellent service for years in the Farm Security Administration and with Mexican-American farm labor, and more recently with Senator HARRY TRUMAN's splendid committee. I hope the Labor Relations Division will follow this up by sending labor attachés to many other capitals, not overlooking men and women from the ranks of A. F. of L. and C. I. O. officialdom.

The Labor Relations Division is headed by an expert, Dr. Otis E. Mulliken. He and Miss Bonnie Farber represented the division at the International Labor Office Conference in Philadelphia. Dr. Mulliken and another assistant have contributed articles to the survey entitled *Inter-American Affairs, 1943*, just published by Columbia University. Mulliken's article in the Department of State Bulletin of August 13, 1944, is a full description of what he hopes to accomplish. He feels that all activities of working men and women abroad influence foreign policy, the vitality of democratic institutions, and world peace. He says that labor affairs are acquiring more and more international importance. The division in addition to advising on foreign labor and social welfare conditions and activities, hopes to send information to our embassies on labor matters here, thus contributing to a better understanding of the United States. Dr. Mulliken plans to keep closely in touch with such bodies as U. N. R. R. A., the Inter-American Committee on Social Security, and the important Institute of Inter-American Affairs, set up by Coordinator Nelson A. Rockefeller to carry on health, sanitation, and related projects of the Office of Inter-American Affairs for a year or two after the war. I heartily approve of Mr. Mulliken's program.

Perhaps his division can undertake the compilation and publication of a *Who's Who in Labor and Social Welfare in Latin America* to answer criticism by progressive publications of the paucity of inter-American labor information and ties in a period of crisis. Such a work would prove an invaluable reference for the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and many United States Government agencies.

OFFICE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs—C. I. A. A.—has carried out a number of projects highly beneficial to labor and has distributed much labor information. The C. I. A. A. recently set up a division to handle the inter-American training program under which Latin Americans receive advanced training here in industry, agriculture, and public health.

The C. I. A. A. along with the A. F. of L. arranged for 1,000 Mexican railroad mechanics to take training here so that

more minerals from Mexico can be shipped over Mexican lines to our war plants. A recent C. I. A. A. survey disclosed that 10 United States cities are planning improved economic relations with Latin America in addition to the cultural and educational activities carried out by inter-American centers. In Philadelphia, for example, a commercial guide book in Spanish and Portuguese is planned. The C. I. A. A. Press Division continues to distribute inter-American labor news, published only in the small, struggling labor publications, since the so-called free big city press largely ignores labor news when it does not deliberately distort it for selfish political reasons. George Seldes' little weekly *In Fact* regularly exposes the partisan bias of the big-business-controlled press and radio.

Marshall Field's pro-labor New York paper *PM* on July 2 carried a story by Gardner Jackson to the effect that the labor clauses in our procurement contracts in Latin America are about done for because of the betrayal of labor to our financial interests by American ambassadors. These clauses in 200 contracts were introduced by the Board of Economic Warfare under Vice President WALLACE and Milo Perkins to improve health and working conditions, and were hailed by the International Labor Office—I. L. O.—which said:

It is the first time in history that one nation, in negotiating for the products of another, has given an express guaranty against the exploitation of labor; has realistically recognized that laboring men and women who receive a fair wage and work reasonable hours under decent conditions actually produce more and better products than those who do not.

COORDINATOR NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

The youthful and talented Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Nelson A. Rockefeller, has made a most favorable impression on Members of the House and Senate during his 4 years in office. I hope that after the C. I. A. A. ceases to exist, Nelson Rockefeller, as a rising business leader of the Americas, will continue to set an example for other capitalists of liberal, fair-minded appreciation of the problems of labor.

Nelson Rockefeller in April told the House Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be a member:

I have gone into labor meetings in various Latin American countries, and sat in cabinet meetings. I found exactly the same frankness and desire to discuss common problems, hopes, and fears in both these groups.

Probably no one could better have answered the extravagant and violently partisan charges against the Good Neighbor policy made by the misguided Republican Senator from Nebraska in the *tory Reader's Digest*. It has been rumored that Mr. Rockefeller was prevented by certain Republicans in the State Department from publicly replying to Senator BUTLER. But Senator McKELLAR did not hesitate on behalf of the administration to make a sweeping refutation.

The House Committee on Appropriations on May 25 released a report complimentary to the C. I. A. A.'s record and

citing Rockefeller's statements on the serious dislocations of Latin-American economy and transportation, complicated by grave shortages of fuel and goods. The result of these conditions and of bad inflation is "severe hardships, social unrest, and political instability," Rockefeller pointed out. He has been seeking to alleviate these factors which cut Latin-American labor's contribution to victory, and to combat Axis and Argentine efforts to disrupt hemisphere unity and security.

Nelson Rockefeller organized and ably chaired the Conference of Commissions of Inter-American Development in New York City in May, which passed a resolution on labor urging the American republics to provide greater vocational and technical training for workers and apprentices; to improve diet, health, and sanitation; to protect rights of unionization and collective bargaining; and to pass more and better labor legislation. Finally the gathering asked that employers and employees of the Americas cooperate fully with each other and with their governments for the economic progress of all. Mr. Rockefeller is to be congratulated on the success of the conference, which recognized labor's importance in hemisphere development by recommending that labor be represented on the national development commission of each of the 21 American republics. The chief Brazilian delegate, Valentim Bouças, with whom I have corresponded, at the end of the conference sent President Roosevelt a message reaffirming the solidarity and spirit of cooperation of the Americas.

On September 5 Rockefeller said at the Pan American Union that Latin America wants to develop industrially to raise its standards of living. It will be good business for us to aid them, thereby assuring ourselves export markets which will help employ United States labor.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The A. F. of L.'s excellent Spanish-language clip sheet, *Noticiero Obrero Norteamericano*, is well disseminated in Latin America, where it reports events of interest to workers, such as my recent request for more labor attachés. It has stressed colossal war production here—an answer to the lies in Republican papers about strikes. The September 11 issue emphasized the need for fair pay after victory, for more liberal reconversion and unemployment legislation, ample aid to returning veterans, William Green's Labor Day salute to Latin-American workers, and the A. F. of L.'s significant statement that it will seek to register its 7,000,000 members and encourage them to vote for labor's friends in November.

The I. L. O. is expected by William Green to play an increasingly important post-war role in the great conflict against the forces of hate and oppression. Mr. Green and United States Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins on August 20 broadcast a tribute on the tenth anniversary of our membership in the I. L. O. Mr. Green predicted a period of unexampled international cooperation and efforts to abolish poverty among all races and nations.

A. F. of L. leaders in July asked Mr. Hull to protest to the Fascist government of Argentina, which is following Hitler's technique of destroying labor unions, the chief bulwark of democracy.

Robert J. Watt, as A. F. L. international representative, gave a statesman-like speech in May before the Conference of Commissions of Inter-American Development. Mr. Watt said that labor here is keenly interested in mutually beneficial use of continental resources and rising standards of living. Peace depends on the practice of civilized economics, the sharing of common prosperity to avoid common poverty. Labor must create economic democracy, says Bob Watt. In many Latin lands the economy is feudal. With millions of workers' families in serf-like conditions. This is a political, social, and ecclesiastical problem as much as economic. Industry and the public must help. Watt concluded by asking, "Let us join with men of good will everywhere and prosper by common effort and mutual aid."

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The C. I. O. was represented at the same session of the conference by James B. Carey who spoke of the importance to our workers of increased productive power in Latin America and the improvement of its internal market. Carey feels we should enter the fields of nutrition, public health, education and the enjoyment by workers of trade union organization. Our workers want poverty ended throughout the hemisphere. They want a sound basis for living standards and no post-war doles. The C. I. O. backs the labor clauses aimed at safeguarding Latin-American production for our war plants. The C. I. O. resents the undercover sabotage of these labor clauses by certain Government officials and diplomats.

Jim Carey asked why labor had been denied to date a voice in hemisphere councils. The C. I. O. intends to watch any tendency of Wall Street to move industries to South America to profiteer from sweatshop labor there. Industrialization everywhere should be sound and built on fair labor policies. Under the name of continental solidarity labor in Latin America must not lose its few hard-won rights. Carey suggested that labor share in every phase of the planning and direction of inter-American economic activity to achieve genuine security. Labor is opposed to imperialism and political interference in Latin-American affairs. The C. I. O. wants no subtle combinations of United States economic power with local dictatorships. The victories of peace are as hard to win as those of war. The chief struggle ahead is the battle against the poverty that grips most of the population of the Americas.

Jacob S. Potofsky, the capable chairman of the C. I. O. Committee on Latin-American Affairs and an official of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, in line with what Jim Carey said about labor's interest in the proposed Inter-American Technical Economic Conference, wrote Mr. Hull that organized labor here wants higher Latin-American living levels because our prosperity is involved in theirs.

Mr. Potofsky wants suitable labor representation.

Other members of the C. I. O. committee are George Baldanzi of the transport workers, who went to Italy this year to study labor conditions along with Luigi Antonini of the A. F. of L.'s International Ladies Garment Workers Union; J. P. Selly of the communications union; O. A. Knight of the oil workers; Milton Murray of the Newspaper Guild; Joseph P. Curran of the militantly progressive maritime union; S. J. Hogan of the marine engineers; L. J. Clark of the packing-house workers; L. S. Buckmaster of the rubber workers; D. J. McDonald of the steel workers; and Martin C. Kyne of the store workers, a noted liberal Catholic labor figure.

In May, Jacob Potofsky and Sidney Hillman went to Chicago for their union's convention, which passed a resolution backing the good-neighbor policy and asking for closer relations between workers of the hemisphere. Fascist plots and Argentine tyranny were denounced for suppressing the free labor movement. The convention resolved to urge our Government to help labor and peoples' movements in Latin America to establish democracies. Sidney Hillman asked that an international labor conference be called in which Soviet trade unions could participate, and that labor sit at the peace table. Mrs. Roosevelt addressed the clothing workers and was enthusiastically applauded when she asked for close American collaboration with the other United Nations for world stabilization to raise our national income level.

Lombardo Toledano and some other strongly anti-Fascist Latin labor delegates to the I. L. O. conference were guests in May at a C. I. O. luncheon in New York. Lombardo declared that workers south of the border greatly admire United States labor and are worried about the November elections. "To assure the reelection of President Roosevelt is to reassure the whole world," he asserted. The visiting Latins were likewise entertained by the Council for Pan-American Democracy, which publishes a magazine, the Americas, and pamphlets on the C. T. A. L. and labor's Good Neighbor policy.

Like Latin-American labor, the New York weeklies, *Pueblos Hispanos* and *The Americas*, are deeply concerned over the plight of nearly 2,000,000 Americans of Spanish speech in Puerto Rico, where hunger, unemployment, and misery are rife. As President Roosevelt has told Congress in urging legislation, Puerto Rico deserves aid and more self-government. Until we really help poor Puerto Rico or grant self-government, this country will continue to be criticized severely in Latin America. The forthcoming book on Puerto Rican problems and solutions by New Deal Gov. Rex Tugwell should help clarify this bad situation, about which the C. I. O. is deeply sympathetic.

Out in my part of the country, the C. I. O. mine and smelter union is doing fine work to remove discriminations against Americans of Mexican ancestry. Racial discrimination against Mexican-

Americans from Texas to California greatly injures our reputation. Forthright Secretary Ickes has assailed our intolerance to minorities. Senator Chavez, of New Mexico, is demanding a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. He has broadcast in Spanish to Latin America trying to explain our still insufficient efforts to halt prejudice against non-Caucasians and to combat Axis short-wave radio propaganda to Latin America, which is largely non-Caucasian. The A. F. of L. has also helped in this struggle against racism. The labor movement is the chief hope of all minorities. Their next best friend is the Roosevelt administration. Republicanism offers almost nothing to either labor or minorities but broken platform promises.

LABOR DEPARTMENT'S WOMEN'S BUREAU

In previous speeches on inter-American labor relations, I inadvertently omitted to mention the helpful work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor and of Dr. E. D. Owen, who has devoted many years to compiling information on Latin-American labor. The Bureau issues a pamphlet on labor conditions.

Miss Mary Anderson has retired after 25 years as director of the Women's Bureau, during which time interest in Latin America has grown steadily. This year Miss Anderson and I participated in the conference called by the tireless reformer Benjamin C. Marsh, head of the People's Lobby, on the Century of the Common Man versus the Century of Cartel Control. Miss Anderson is a splendid type of Scandinavian-American, like thousands of residents of my State.

Miss Frieda Miller on August 17 succeeded Mary Anderson as Director of the Bureau, and said that the Division of Inter-American Affairs is one of its chief activities. Under a new cooperative program with Latin America, the Labor Department has invited the republics to send qualified women here to study and exchange information. Brazil, Chile, and Mexico have accepted. I hope these women observers can visit the State of Washington, one of the most progressive in labor affairs.

The director of women's education in Colombia lunched recently with Mrs. Roosevelt. The First Lady does more to promote pan-Americanism than any dozen tory ambassadors and State Department bureaucrats. She is one of the world's outstanding women, and will be so described by future historians, Republican smears notwithstanding.

LOMBARDO TOLEDANO ASSAILS ARGENTINA

Vicente Lombardo Toledano, as Latin America's top laborite, dramatically focused this country's attention on the menace of Argentine fascism at the I. L. O. conference. Allied Labor News, a progressive New York news agency, has been the chief distributor of information about Lombardo's crusade against Argentina on the danger to the Americas of Franco. Their August 26 story from Mexico City is captioned, "Spain revolt will follow Nazi defeat, says Lombardo." Excellent. Franco will soon fall unless our State Department appeasers further

bolster his tottering tyranny. Lombardo terms Colonel Peron the real master of Argentina, who can count on the support of Franco.

Today Lombardo is worried about rightist elements in Brazil. This year he visited Brazil and talked to leaders of the Vargas regime and the long-quiet labor and democratic movements. Lombardo said then that Brazil's active war role not only improved her international standing but aided her progress toward democracy, since President Vargas has repeatedly promised elections after victory. In April Lombardo saw Brazilian labor holding the key to Brazilian democracy, despite the absence of labor's right either to organize or strike. In 1941, and again this year, I made speeches analyzing Brazilian affairs and its deep friendship for us. Hence, in spite of the resignation of pro-American Foreign Minister Aranha and the alarm of progressive publications here, I cannot believe that Brazil will ever desert this country. Roland Hall Sharp, in the *Christian Science Monitor*, says that the real danger is that Brazil, armed by us, may drift into war with Argentina.

It is significant that Lombardo, without any encouragement or thanks from the State Department Republicans, has done more than any other man in Mexico to win friends for us and the United Nations among laborers, leftists, and the common people. The Mexican leader has united Mexican progressives in a new liberal league which seeks national economic autonomy and progress and will publish a paper and progressive magazine.

THE DEBATE ABOUT QUARANTINING ARGENTINA

Labor has a big stake in the outcome of the current debate over whether economic sanctions or a quarantine should be enforced against Argentina. Moderates like Sumner Welles and Laurence Duggan oppose the risk of inciting the proud and intensely nationalistic Argentinians to supporting their disliked dictatorship, which might happen if we got tough. The Argentinians are 80 percent democratic and perhaps can be more subtly helped to overthrow their tyrants.

Dr. Felix J. Weil, of the Institute of Social Research at Columbia University and the Latin American Economic Institute, is an Argentine-born economist who has sent me the galley proofs of his valuable book, *Argentine Riddle*, containing much data on or of interest to labor, being published October 19 by John Day. Dr. Weil declared in a debate in print with Ray Josephs for Fred G. Clark's American Economic Foundation that a boycott of Buenos Aires cannot be undertaken anyway, because of Britain's dependence on Argentine trade and food and her vast investments there. Moreover, our striped-pants diplomats, who now aid many dictators, would never encourage a revolution against fascism in Argentina, even though Americans are dying on battle fronts to defeat fascism outside this hemisphere.

Ray Josephs, long Marshall Field's correspondent in Buenos Aires and author of *Argentine Diary*, takes the same tough position as most hemisphere labor

leaders. Argentina is still prosperous because Britain and we continue to buy her meat and grains, the basis of the national life. Josephs says it is therefore up to London and us to boycott Argentina until depression forces an internal housecleaning to regain trade and prosperity.

Many who are anxious about Argentina have read Josephs' piece in *PM* of September 11 and see an unhappy parallel between political apathy among workers here and beside the River Plate. He writes that Argentine workers largely ignore their political fate because it is hard to arouse men with full stomachs and heavy purses. Nevertheless, reaction is being fought by courageous Argentine labor leaders and political patriots underground and in exile. And in our country, labor statesmen like William Green, Philip Murray, Sidney Hillman, Dave Beck, and Daniel Tobin are trying to arouse our workers to their political opportunity and fate. I hope they succeed.

Possibly Argentine fascism will be destroyed by labor and liberals through the political weapon of a general strike for democracy. Publications like the *Nation*, *Commonsense*, *New Republic*, and *Free World* remind us that such general strikes overthrew tyranny in Ecuador, Guatemala, and El Salvador this year. The pioneer Latin American general strike which turned out a tyrant occurred in 1931, when students were joined by unions and professional men in Chile to oust a dictator despite his backing by the army and special police and by Wall Street, where he had floated huge, usurious, and unsound loans.

For the United Nations to refuse to do business with Argentina is not interference in its internal affairs, but is simply a refusal to subsidize fascism. Argentina threatens to become a haven of Fascist criminals and Nazi cartels plotting another world war. Two Assistant Attorneys General have spoken out against the Nazi cartel menace. They are Norman Littell, of Seattle, and Wendell Berge, whose new book, *Cartels: Challenge to a Free World*, was published by the Public Affairs Press. Cartels, as I have warned on many occasions, threaten labor everywhere.

In my speech, *Defense and Democracy in Latin America*, of March 25, 1941, I declared, and it still applies:

Hispanic America's harassed democrats cannot be expected to continue their faith in our system of government if the officials of the great democracy of the North betray them while its people sleep.

George Seldes (In Fact, March 10, 1941) says this republic can extend its aid and open its markets in exchange not only for promises of democracy from Latin America's dictators, but for actions establishing democracy there now. Those who block this are the betrayers of the good neighbors.

NEWSPAPERS AND LATIN-AMERICAN LABOR

I wish to pay tribute to some of the few writers in this field. But first I want to point out that the three chief means of information—the press, radio, and motion pictures—have showed their subservience to Wall Street by shamefully ignoring or deliberately maligning labor. Marshall Field's *Chicago Sun* and *PM*

have been notable exceptions among newspapers. So has the great international daily, *The Christian Science Monitor*, which recently carried a penetrating series of 39 articles by Roland Hall Sharp entitled *Uncensored South America*, which is soon to appear in book form.

The *Monitor* under the splendid editorship of Erwin Canham carries much material useful to the Government on labor. Unlike most Republican papers, it is honest, never smears labor, and sharply criticizes the State Department's appeasement of Franco. The *Monitor* reported my efforts to get the Department to break with Spain and help restore the Spanish Republic, which would have magnificent repercussions in Latin America. The *Monitor* maintains one of the finest bureaus in the capital of any paper, and carries correspondence of progressives like Selden Menefee of the State of Washington. Moreover, it is not subservient to reactionary pressure groups which think they can brow-beat labor into refraining from political activity by hiring expensive talent to plant phony arguments in the kept press and magazines which smear the National Citizens Political Action Committee. The same groups are pouring millions into the G. O. P. campaign while howling about labor's collection of a few thousand dollars.

One example will suffice to show how radio rigs things against labor. Mrs. Maria Hoge, former director of the Office of Inter-American Relations at Stanford University and now a lecturer in California cities and colleges, has been denied radio time to tell Americans about labor and democracy in Latin America. Yet California stations and the national networks are able to find time for conservative commentators on far less vital topics.

PROGRESSIVE WRITERS ON LATIN AMERICA

An example of a book of value to both labor and management is the new volume on the development of Brazil with American aid, by Morris L. Cooke, the distinguished engineer who headed the technical mission to Brazil in 1942 for Wallace's B. E. W. Along with Philip Murray, Mr. Cooke did a book on organized labor and production. Both Mr. Cooke and I are members of the Cooperative Forum in the capital. Earlier this year it was suggested that Morris Cooke might be named ambassador to Bolivia to replace the tory whose bungling finally proved too much even for the State Department to stomach. I can think of no abler expert to represent us in a land which badly needs help.

Charles Anderson Gauld, of the State of Washington and now in New York, has told me often of the importance of Brazilian-American economic cooperation, especially in the development of Brazilian iron and alloy meals, on which we must now increasingly rely. Mr. Gauld has written articles on Brazil and inter-American relations, several of which I have called to the attention of Congress and had reprinted for distribution throughout the hemisphere. Gauld is now preparing a major study on Brazil's great mining state. He and

I share membership in the Latin American Economic Institute.

The Latin American Economic Institute and its parent organization, the Research Bureau for Post-war Economics, in addition to sponsoring Dr. Felix Weil's book, *Argentine Riddle*, are issuing other studies which concern labor. Among them are surveys of post-war migration to South America, Caribbean economic problems, and Brazil's textile industry and post-war problems. Dr. J. F. Normano, research director, is an authority on Brazil and has developed close ties with the Brazilian Society of Political Economy of Rio.

Allan Chase, author of the best study of Falangist penetration in Latin America, wrote in the *August Coronet* that a democratic revolution in Spain would lead to an immediate democratic and trade-union revival in Latin America. Mr. Chase says such events would end fascism there and, by raising living levels, create greater markets for our exports and stymie Nazi cartel plans in Argentina.

A book of interest to labor writers is *Pan American Economics*, by Paul R. Olson—not to be confused with my capable secretary, Paul A. Olson, of Tacoma, who is well known to many Members of Congress, and whose equally pro-labor brother, Ernest Olson, is running for the State senate from Tacoma, with strong union support.

PAY-OFF IN NOVEMBER

The fate of labor in this hemisphere will be deeply affected by the November elections. Labor has until then to marshal its forces and save itself from disaster. The pattern of the economic development of the Americas for years to come will soon be decided. It is up to labor to make that decision one for cooperative pan-American progress through Roosevelt liberalism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include a eulogy of the Reverend Dominic Ternan, late a chaplain of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include a broadcast made by President Sergio Osmena to the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include an address delivered at the U. A. W. convention at Grand Rapids.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THEN AND NOW

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, the other day on the floor of the House a Member shouted: "Clear everything with Sidney." In view of that action the following lines might not be out of place:

THEN AND NOW

THEN

Oh, Sidney, why only five thousand?
And why not a little more?
I want to be district attorney
And perhaps can't make the score
Unless you're a bit more liberal
And open your purse again.
So come across, dear Sidney,
Support me with might and main.

NOW

Oh, Sidney, why do you forsake me?
You helped me that other day.
Now you've transferred your affection
And are helping another, they say.
What you now do is very wicked.
You've no right to turn about face.
I'll tell the voters about it
And yours will be the disgrace.

ITALIAN RELIEF

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said concerning the unfortunate plight of the Italians of occupied Italy. By this time we may well say that the sufferings of the Italians, and the terrific destruction wrought upon their land, are common knowledge. Italy ranks high on the list of countries tortured and ravaged by the Nazis.

Italy knows the meaning of having innocent persons torn away from their families, held as hostages and later killed. It also knows the meaning of workers' battalions filled with many of its people, transferred to Germany against their wishes, and made to slave for the glory and future of Hitler's dream world.

There is hardly any cruelty inflicted by the Nazis on the people of other countries that has not been duplicated against Italians, especially since the time that they have come over to our side. The knowledge on the part of the Nazis, that the Italians were eagerly coming over to our side, worked them to such a fury that no cruelty or torture was spared to wreak vengeance.

It was well known by the Allies that the Italian people were never given a voice as to whether they should get into this war at all. And, certainly, they had no choice as to sides. They had no voice whatever in their government and they were as much victims of Hitler, by virtue of his domination of Mussolini, as have been the people of Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and other Nazi occupied countries.

Italy was thrown into the conflict on the side of Hitler by the Italian politicians, acting under Hitler's order and certainly against the wishes of its people. In this connection I should like to recall the words of Prime Minister Churchill, uttered on December 23, 1940, and addressed to the Italian people. They are as follows:

One man and one man alone, against the crown and the royal family of Italy, against the Pope and all the authority of the Vatican and the Roman Catholic Church, against the wishes of the Italian people, has arrayed the trustees and inheritors of ancient Rome upon the side of the ferocious pagan barbarians.

Two and one-half years later, more particularly on June 11, 1943, President Roosevelt said as follows:

The irresponsible acts of which the United Nations complained were not committed by the Italian people. * * * They were the acts of Premier Mussolini's personal Fascist regime, which did not actually represent the Italian people.

During the time that Italy was an unwilling partner of Hitler, many Americans addressed the people of Italy by short wave, imploring them to rise and rebel against the Fascist rulers and holding out to them the promise of Allied succor. I do not think that it is idle speculation to say that the Italian people have the greatest trust in the United States. They trust our country. They trust our President and they believe that we are anxious to help them. However, the time has come for us to review the record in order that we may arrive at a conclusion relative to the advisability of continuing the present relief scheme in Italy as it has thus far been in force.

Italy presents an immense emergency relief problem. Unfortunately, it has not been treated as such. It seems that the underlying principle for the present treatment of Italy is the fact that it is a former enemy country. It is still a battleground and the Army is the deciding factor on the question of essential supplies for the Italian civilian population. However, this is definitely the wrong approach. The Italian people are fighting alongside of the Allies and, while we have coined the word "cobelligent" to designate Italy, the fact remains that she is to all intents and purposes an out-and-out ally. Certainly as to the question of relief for its civilian population, it should be treated as such.

That the present practice is far from satisfactory is attested by General O'Dwyer's visit to our country, made for the purpose of advising the proper authorities of the necessity for a change in the system of civilian assistance. Unless we bring about a definite improvement soon, Anglo-American prestige will suffer a terrific blow. This is likely because the ability of the Allies to bring about order and proper living in the first country placed under their control will go a long way toward the establishment of harmonious relations between the Allies and the other countries of Europe.

The first thing to be done, and I hope done soon, is to increase the relief which is presently available to the Italians. No one contends that the relief program is

adequate. The best indication of the inadequacy of allied assistance is to be found in the infant mortality rate, published by the allied medical authorities as being 50 percent.

The member nations of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration are now meeting in Montreal, Canada. The first order of business should be the immediate consideration of aid to Italy. This step would be in keeping with the underlying principle on which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was organized, viz: To relieve the suffering of civilian populations in the war zone and to help them build their lives anew. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was created solely for charitable purposes and it should not be kept from doing its work because of some technicality, raised by some member nation, which may still be harboring an unfounded prejudice against innocent victims. The failure to give proper aid to Italy will result in chaos, social unrest and, possibly, open revolution. We must not fail in demonstrating to the world that we keep the promises which we have heretofore made. Our failure in Italy at this time will amount to our failure in Europe.

With these thoughts in mind I introduced a resolution yesterday which seeks to put the House of Representatives on record as favoring immediate aid to the people of Italy by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I hope that this resolution be adopted as soon as possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. COCHRAN asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a report on the Corps of Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Charlotte Observer of September 9, there appeared a message which it states has been signed and endorsed by thousands of southern Democrats and is submitted by them to the Democrats of America. This is a message which should be read by every American. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have this declaration printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY, 1862-1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Steven McGroarty has passed to the bosom of his Maker. He was my predecessor here in this Hall, having served in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. His death occurred on August 7, 1944. The green Verdugo Hills of California will be lonely without him, but gentle echoes of his footsteps will linger there.

A kindly man, a real and true friend, who spoke in humble phrases that pleased God and man; he was poet laureate of California, author of the Mission Play, and writer of soul-stirring prose.

While a Member of this honorable body, he wrote a weekly column for the Los Angeles Times entitled "Under the Capitol's Dome," which brought the people nearer to their Government and the men who comprise it. He had been a staff writer of the Times for 40 years.

Those here who served with him will mourn the passing of this distinguished citizen, their former colleague, and will treasure sweet memories of him.

While John McGroarty and I differed in politics, we were good friends personally. He held my highest respect and esteem for his honesty and integrity, forthrightness, and consummate courage. He did not fear to oppose his own party when he believed them wrong. He was a true American. May God rest his strong yet gentle soul.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McGroarty's death occurred at a time when I was necessarily away from Washington on official business. I have waited until now to enter this official notice in order to include in my remarks the beautiful eulogy of Monsignor Keating, archbishop of Los Angeles. I therefore ask unanimous consent to include that eulogy, an editorial from the Los Angeles Times, and a biography of John Steven McGroarty with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY, 1862-1944

(Eulogy by Msgr. Martin Cody Keating at funeral mass in St. Vibiana's Cathedral. The Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, D. D., archbishop of Los Angeles, presiding)

"My brothers," as St. Francis would say, "God give you peace"

Love of God and love of country are the two noblest motives that can inspire a human act. To these add a love for every human being, everywhere, because made in God's image by the Father of all, regardless of race, or creed, or social condition, and you have a symphony of life, with God's peace in your heart.

This truth John Steven McGroarty learned in childhood from his saintly Irish mother in the Pennsylvania he liked to refer to as "Penns Woods." His constant fidelity to this Christian and American ideal of human brotherhood, under the fatherland of God,

is the key to his Franciscan spirit and his legacy to California.

The twelfth and last child of Mary McGinty and Hugh McGroarty, he was born on the 20th day of August 1862. When he was old enough to observe a birthday he and his mother kept his birthday on her own birthday, the 15th of August, the Feast of Our Lady's Assumption into Heaven. Because the babe was so frail the priest baptized him the day of his birth in his father's house at Buck Mountain. John was a month old when Lincoln proclaimed the emancipation of the slaves. He was 11 months old when the Battle of Gettysburg in his native State orphaned the baby girl who was destined to become his bride.

His mother was a native of Glenties, Donegal. Years ago, when "a loan from God," as he called it, enabled him to seek out the cottage where his mother was born, he brought a flagstone from the garden path her girlish feet had trod for his own hearth high in the Verdugo Hills. His father, from the same county but a neighboring parish, was the child of Nancy Montgomery and kin to Gen. Richard Montgomery, of Donegal, the friend of Washington, the hero of the Plains of Abraham, outside Quebec, and the first general to die for American independence. The brilliant General Montgomery of the British Army, now battling in France, is a native of Ireland and of the same family.

Forty years ago he came to Los Angeles where he began his unique Apostolate for God and America. In the columns of the Los Angeles Times he presided, every Sunday, over an imaginary synagogue of the faithful wherein membership was open to all who believe in God and talk with God in morning and evening prayer, each according to the formula of his or her own creed.

From his schooling in Penns Woods he had never lost the echo of the voice of the gentle English Quaker who had been obliged to defend himself against the charge of being a Jesuit because his charter of religious liberty for Pennsylvania in 1682 was of the broadest character. That tree of liberty, planted by William Penn in the woods of Pennsylvania, brought within its benign shade and protection all who professed belief in one Almighty God, and excluded only atheists and polytheists. To that tree of liberty from Penns Woods our poet laureate engrafted the California oak to keep sentinel watch over his synagogue of the faithful.

It was with vision almost prophetic that this humble Knight of the Holy Cross mapped the strategy, even 40 years ago, that now we understand must become the spirit of American education if the Americanism of the founding fathers is to withstand the attacks of atheistic Marxian communism. Thanks to the conductor of the synagogue, as he titled his role, countless thousands understand today that it is the American way to believe in the Creator—God as the source of the citizen's rights; that it is not the American way to say there is no God, as the Marxians teach; that it is the American way to leave everyone free to define the Supreme Being according to the light God gives one—not because one definition of God is as good as another—but because God will not save any man at the expense of man's freedom. How often our beloved conductor of the synagogue repeated the warning of William Penn—"Liberty, without obedience, is confusion; and obedience, without liberty, is slavery."

To the conductor of the synagogue came one day an invitation from Frank Miller, the founder of the Mission Inn, Riverside. The kind Quaker wanted this gifted Catholic poet and dramatist to write a nativity play to be shown each Christmas season at the inn. Three months John McGroarty was Frank Miller's guest. What a host. What a guest. They loved each other as brothers. Each hailed the poor man of Assisi—the

most poetic because the most realistic of all the saints—as his patron saint. The Mission Play, the passion play of California, was born.

Frank Miller, the Quaker, raised the Father Serra Memorial Cross on Rubidoux Mountain for the eloquent Bishop Conaty to bless and President Taft to honor by unveiling a bronze plaque to the memory of the brave soldier of Christ who first preached on these shores the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. John McGroarty, the Catholic, with chaste and restrained art, dramatized the beauty and the romance and the faith that was Spain and the unequalled charity that was Franciscan California. We shall not look upon their like again.

Father Junipero and his tireless brethren our poet laureate loved to salute as "Dreamers of God." He, too, was a dreamer of God. His faith was as simple as that of a child. Because he was a poet his faith was dramatic in its expression. Who will ever forget his gentle reverence of manner, bespeaking the faith in his heart, when, accompanied by the two altar boys carrying lighted candles, his very presence in the prologue of the Mission Play, even before he uttered a word, converted the hum of a theater into the hush of a church, so respectful was the attention he spontaneously and so sweetly received?

When, as Congressman, he was financially able to make one of his dreams come true and he and his beloved wife were able to donate the property that is now graced by the rarely beautiful church and rectory of Our Lady of Lourdes in his dear Verdugo Hills, he said to his faithful shepherd, his padre of the hills: "When I assist at mass, Father Falvey, I can see our divine Lord walking down the dusty roads of Galilee, giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, life to the dead, and pardon to poor sinners like me."

All who knew John McGroarty will agree that he did not need to tell you that he loved his fellow men. Instinctively you felt it as he looked at you so kindly, as he listened to you so intently and so patiently. His was a forthright conviction that you were God's child as surely as he was. Somewhere in this city today—and if able to attend I am sure not far from this cathedral altar—is a young Negro girl, whose ambition to become a writer found new encouragement from the friendship of our poet laureate. One day she wrote to ask the privilege of an interview to get his counsel. His reply was an invitation for her and her mother to join him and the padre of the hills in luncheon in his gray house in the hills.

John McGroarty's hand was never closed against his brother's greater need. How sweetly the bread of his charity came back to him in his need. His life cheered by the presence, love, and care of his nieces and nephews. He so appreciated being loved by those he loved. How deep the gratitude of his heart when he told the niece who had crossed the continent to see him ere he died: "I am glad you came. It will show them here you thought well of me at home."

What greater tribute could be paid to any man than to have his archbishop and Mr. Harry Chandler, his employer of 40 years, rivals for the privilege of giving comfort to him in his last days? He never tired telling his intimates that "Mr. Chandler is a grand man to work for." In his last years, when his trips to Los Angeles were less frequent, he never failed to call on Mr. Chandler. Always he came away refreshed and with a heart full of gratitude for such a kind employer.

The thrill of his Catholic life came when his archbishop conferred on him, at the command of His Holiness, the Knighthood of St. Gregory in acknowledgment of his labors for God and America. This tribute received the enthusiastic approval of all who knew him and by none more whole-heartedly than his countless non-Catholic friends.

His two terms in Congress found him happiest when he could remedy injustice done his beloved Indian brothers and the little people of America, the great mass of the workers, threatened by an irreligious capitalism. His devotion to the veterans of World War No. 1 amounted to a passion. He never forgot the memory of the tragedy of his boyhood when the wounded of the Civil War were returned to their communities in freight cars to become again in the mines the victims of ruthless unregulated competition. With all the force of his ardent nature he often said: "The man who bares his breast to the foe, even though he never is wounded, even though he never takes part in actual combat but has offered his services at any price his country may demand, deserves the complete gratitude of his country; nothing is too good for the veteran."

Nothing in his life was so worthy of him as his death. A day or two before he died his pastor asked him: "John, how do you feel?" "Father Falvey," he replied, "when I close my eyes at night I don't know on what side of Jordan I shall be when they open in the morning. But, Father, I am ready." As the hour of his passing approached he complained to his niece that he was not able to see the crucifix hanging on the wall. "Margaret, fix me so I can see the crucifix." Tenderly she changed his position and he was content, his eyes fixed on the symbol of his only hope. A Sister of Charity, skilled in the angelic art of robbing death of its fears, pressed a small crucifix to his lips, saying: "Sir John, kiss the cross." The gentle caress of his Saviour's image was the last conscious act of the grand soul who made his beloved Father Junipero the revered neighbor of every Californian.

The night before, when his nephew John McHale, asked him: "Uncle, how do you feel?" he answered in the lines of his last poem—

"When I have had my little day,
My chance at toll, my fling at play,
And in the starry silence fall
With broken staff against the wall,
May someone pass, God grant, that way,
And, as he bends above me, say:

"Good night, dear comrade, sleep you well,
Deep are the daisies where you fell;
I fold your empty hands that shared
Their little all with them that fared
Beside you in the rain and sun—
Good night, your little day is done."

And now, Sir John, uniting my voice with that of your revered archbishop, with the voices of the beloved ministers of your funeral mass and the faithful friends who crowd this venerable sanctuary, as well as the priests who whisper your name this day at every mission altar from San Diego to Sonoma, I pray: "May the angels lead thee into Paradise, may the martyrs receive thee at thy coming and take thee to Jerusalem, the Holy City; may the choir of the angels receive thee and mayest thou, with thy beloved Father Junipero, find rest everlasting. Amen."

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 9, 1944]

LIFE OF JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY COMES TO END

John Steven McGroarty, poet, philosopher, lawyer, playwright, sometime politician, and friend of man, has gone to his last reward. Had he lived to August 20, he would have been 82 years of age. The poet laureate of California—a post to which he was named by action of the legislature in 1933—lived a full and fully useful life and his passing leaves a void that will not be filled. There could only be one McGroarty.

The Times, with which he had been continuously associated for more than 40 years, feels a particularly poignant sense of loss.

McGroarty became acquainted with the late Gen. Harrison Gray Otis through a poem he wrote on the death of Krupp, German cannon manufacturer, and soon joined the staff of the paper.

In 1911 he took leave of absence to write his best-known work, the Mission Play, the story of Fr. Serra and the establishment of the California missions. This play, first produced in 1912, played altogether to an audience of more than 2,500,000 persons. The recovery and restoration of the ancient missions—some of which were being used as stables when he began his campaign—was one of his most notable achievements.

McGroarty's essay in politics came when he ran for Congress in 1934. He was elected and reelected in 1936, but retired at the close of his second term. Many honors came to him including honorary degrees and a decoration from the Pope; but he valued nothing so much as the friendship and respect of his neighbors—in which category he included the whole southern California community, without respect to race or creed.

He devoted his whole life to making friends. It is impossible to imagine him having an enemy.

BIOGRAPHICAL

California, Eleventh District: Los Angeles County. Assembly districts 42, 43, 47, and 48. Population (1930), 284,952.

John Steven McGroarty, Democrat, of Tujunga, Calif.; native of Pennsylvania, in which State he was elected justice of the peace when 21 years of age; treasurer of his native county of Luzerne at 26, admitted to the bar of Pennsylvania at 32, later served on the legal staff of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. in Montana; removed to California in 1902, joining the editorial staff of the Los Angeles Times that year; author of books, California: Its History and Romance, The Kings Highway, Songs Along the Way, Wander Songs, Just California, and Other Poems, and The Mass; author and producer of plays—The Mission Play, which has had a consecutive run of 21 years, La Golondrina, and El Dorado—which three plays form a trilogy of California historic dramas—Osceola, Babylon, and Romany; honorary degrees of doctor of literature (Litt. D.) from the University of Southern California and Loyola University; honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL. D.), University of Santa Clara; created Knight of St. Gregory by Pope Pius XI; created Knight Commander of Isabella the Catholic by King Alfonso XIII of Spain, and later confirmed by the Spanish Republic; made the third poet laureate of California by action of the State legislature; married; elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress, and reelected to the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret, genuine sorrow, that we receive the sad tidings of the passing of our dear friend and former colleague, the Honorable John Steven McGroarty, late a Member of the Congress of the United States, one who served with distinction in this historic Chamber as a Representative from the State of California during the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

Of all of those with whom I have labored in legislative halls, moved with in friendly association, struggled with in moments of disagreement, there was never one whom I held in higher respect or warmer affection. I never knew a kindlier, gentler, more lovable man. May his soul rest in that peace which he hath earned.

In the fullness of life there came from his facile, inspired pen, a poem of exaltation, one oft repeated wherever the Eng-

lish language is spoken. "Just California," he entitled it. Later, as the sum total of his years grew greater, when the burdens of life were heavier on his aging shoulders, he once again poised his pen to write a Requiem, this in contemplation of life's inevitable conclusion.

In these two poems, Mr. Speaker, is revealed the true, the real John Steven McGroarty, his gentle nature, his kindly philosophy, the man that is within the man. I know of no better way to pay tribute to our departed friend than to read them into the Record of these sad proceedings. For, indeed, in these immortal lines the John Steven McGroarty whom we knew and learned to love lives on.

Permit me to recite:

JUST CALIFORNIA

"Twixt the seas and the deserts,
"Twixt the wastes and the waves,
Between the sands of buried lands
And ocean's coral caves;
It lies not East nor West,
But like a scroll unfurled,
Where the hand of God hath flung it
Down the middle of the world.

It lies where God hath spread it
In the gladness of His eyes.
Like a flame of jeweled tapestry
Beneath His shining skies;
With the green of woven meadows,
The hills in golden chains,
The light of leaping rivers,
And the flash of poppled plains.

Days rise that gleam in glory,
Days die with sunset's brize,
While from Cathay that was of old
Sail countless argosies;
Morns break again in splendor
O'er the giant, new-born West,
But of all the lands God fashioned,
'Tis this land is the best.

Sun and dews that kiss it,
Balmy winds that blow,
The stars in clustered diadems
Upon its peaks of snow;
The mighty mountains o'er it,
Below, the white seas swirled—
Just California, stretching down
The middle of the world.

—John Steven McGroarty.

REQUIEM

When I have had my little day,
My chance at toil, my fling at play,
And in the starry silence fall
With broken staff against the wall,
May someone pass, God grant, that way,
And, as he bends above me, say:

"Good night, dear comrade, sleep you well,
Deep are the daisies where you fell;
I fold your empty hands that shared
Their little all with them that fared
Beside you in the rain and sun—
Good night, your little day is done."

Or, when my little hour has sped,
When night comes, and 'tis time for bed,
The windows closed and locked the door,
And I lie down to wake no more,
May someone at the break of day,
That comes to rouse me, wait to say:

"Farewell, dear comrade, mine no more;
A bird is singing at your door,
And all the highways are athrong
With steps you lightened with your song;
They come to call you from your bed—
Farewell, your little hour is sped."

—John Steven McGroarty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in

the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an address by Dr. Louis J. Karnosh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

(Mr. LEFEVRE asked and received permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two separate subjects in the Appendix of the Record in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an article from the South Bend Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

"CLEAR EVERYTHING WITH SIDNEY"

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Sidney Hillman and his little band of willful men have set out to tell our workers in American industry how to vote. They are moving into congressional districts over the country to tell the people of the respective districts what is best for them. Armed with lavish funds collected from the workers of America, they are trying to fasten their hold upon the Congress of the United States. Where does all their money come from? It comes from the pockets of men and women in American industry—from your family and mine—from people of every race, every creed, every color, yes, every political belief—Republicans and Democrats alike, but all to fasten on America the grip of Sidney Hillman. Does anyone believe that it is really voluntary? Let us look at the facts.

My dad belongs to the C. I. O. One brother does likewise. If I were employed in one of those plants, I, too, would belong to the C. I. O., because I, too, believe in organized labor. I would endeavor to become an active member of my union and to keep it in sound and progressive hands.

I have here a copy of my dad's dues receipt for last April. It is also the official receipt for an extra dollar marked, "International union assessment." That is the kind of money that Sidney Hillman and his original Political Action Committee of eight men used to fasten their grip on America. On the reverse side of this receipt is printed an excerpt from the international constitution of the United Automobile Workers, which says:

ART. 16, SEC. 3. Any member in arrears in dues or assessments, regardless of the method by which such dues or assessments may be collected, within the time required by a local union, which in no case

shall be more than 2 calendar months, unless officially exonerated from the payment of same by the local union, shall automatically be suspended from membership and can be reinstated only by paying a reinstatement fee and such other penalties as may be imposed by the local union in which he is suspended.

You know what that means in a union maintenance shop—either you pay the assessment or you are out of a job. Was there anything voluntary about that? To argue that any workman should refuse to pay such an assessment is to say that a man and his family can live without bread.

That is the kind of money that Hillman used in his preconvention campaign and in the various primaries throughout the country. In an effort to escape the whiplash of public opinion and to keep from being prosecuted under the plain words of existing law, Mr. Hillman now tells us that the hundreds of thousands of dollars still unspent from the above collections are frozen. He announces a new National Citizens' Political Action Committee and tells us that contributions will be accepted from American workers on a voluntary basis.

Just how voluntary will that be? Sidney Hillman and his little carbon copies down the line will attempt to use their power over their members to separate them from their dollars. A union member must make this "voluntary" payment through one of his superiors, or risk the chance of losing the assistance of his union in his contacts with management.

Such an attempt is producing resistance in the ranks of the men and women in the shops of America. Sidney Hillman must learn that he cannot lead Americans around as though he held a ring in their noses. The traditional independence of the American working man and woman is going to rise up against this sort of political bossism.

Hillman and his little band of followers are doing untold damage to the cause of organized labor in America. A prominent labor publication has described it as a fearful boomerang.

It has been said, and rightly so, that Hillman has learned a lot about pressure politics, but not enough about the American people.

When Sidney Hillman and his little band can use the power of their high office to shake down the workers of America to further their own selfish political ambitions, it is high time the people of America roll up their sleeves and get in the fight to save this Republic.

GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I simply take this opportunity to rise for a moment to make a prognosis. When this House convenes after the recess I understand we are going to take in a few days, I predict that the next President will be known by the name of Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein a brief letter from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say many Members will agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], who has just spoken, that it will be "Governor Dewey" after the election.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record to include a series of six separate articles by Luman Long, which appeared in the New York Sun, beginning on Monday, September 11, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Washington Star of last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have not cleared what I am going to say with Sidney, and I do not expect to. I recognize that he is the mainspring back of Mr. Roosevelt's campaign for a fourth term. I recognize that it is very difficult for our Democratic brethren to take the curse of Sidney Hillman's leadership on their shoulders; and how they are smarting under it. Sidney Hillman was able to produce the largest majority in history for the Republican ticket in Maine. Sidney Hillman and the kind of support he is giving to the President will carry the President down to defeat in his effort for a fourth term.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CANNING SUGAR

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, sugar is as hard to obtain in my congressional district at this time as is butter in the City of Washington. We all know what that means.

On September 3 this acute sugar shortage was presented to me by my constituents. I immediately contacted the Sugar Director of the O. P. A. in Washington who showed every desire to be helpful. As a result, some sugar under the regular quota was immediately delivered to retail outlets in my home city of Adrian. This supply, however, is not sufficient for the normal consumption. The peach-canning season is upon us back home. The quantity of peaches is large and the quality is splendid. These peaches and other fruit, all of which is sorely needed at this time, are bound to be lost unless sugar is available immediately. I do not mean 10 days from now, or 30 days from now, but now.

I am speaking today more in behalf of the home canners than of the commercial processors and factories. The method of getting sugar for the two groups can be different. The importance of supplying each group is imminent.

This morning I received a telegram from Michigan as follows:

Following our telegram of September 13 may we offer this suggestion as a possible source from which emergency sugar might be secured. The South generally received adequate sugar during their heavy fruit-canning period. It is within the power of War Food Administration to issue an emergency order now diverting sugar presently destined for normal consumption requirements in the Southern States to Michigan and other States now facing an acute sugar shortage and resultant heavy fruit loss which will fall upon growers and the consuming public. This diversion would necessitate setting back all such orders intended for States which have completed their fruit season such change in priority of orders would have to be routed through to Michigan on a dispatch basis. The element of time is tremendously important but much of the loss can be avoided if the action outlined is taken at once. Please present this suggestion to agencies involved with all possible urgency.

FOOD INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
WALTER F. HAEFFLE, Chairman.

I have just conferred again with the O. P. A., and am advised that offshore refined sugar is being routed in carload lots to those sections in the country in the North, where perishable fruit requires attention. The supply will not be adequate, but some relief can be given. It is fair to presume that these shipments will go largely to the processors and will not be available to the home canners. I cannot too strongly stress the advisability of home-canning sugar. First, the food is essential. Second, the manpower problem, which is acute in our section, is not disturbed when the canning is done at home.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to represent one of those districts where many of the sterling virtues of the pioneer and the people of yesterday have not entirely disappeared. Our farm folks and most of the homemakers still know how to can. War necessities have revived this spirit and it is just too bad that all this fruit is to be lost, and all for the lack of sugar. The spirit of thrift, saving, and living-off-the-land has been lacking in recent years. These frugal habits, however, are not forgotten and now is the time for revival. Our people are willing and

anxious to help, but with no beet sugar available and no cane sugar in sight, they are naturally discouraged. Every Member of Congress from our section is concerned. We are jointly and severally doing everything in our power to alleviate the situation. Canning sugar will not help any when the canning season is passed. Of course, a mistake has been made in sugar planning and regulation. It is just too bad that our people who have worked and saved must now have their peaches and other fruit go to waste.

This is just another case where locking the stable after the horse is gone will not accomplish much.

The Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture advises that there is a method of canning peaches where very little, if any, sugar is used. Of course the taste is different, the color of the canned fruit is different, but the substance is retained. To me, this information is of very little value, and I make clear the unreasonableness of attempting to change the canning habits and customs of a lifetime and embark upon a new method while the peaches are decaying in the baskets.

In short, the Michigan peach canners are not going to get the sugar they need at the moment, every effort of their Representatives in Washington to the contrary notwithstanding.

BOTH ROOSEVELT AND DEWEY SHOULD
REPUDIATE SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] a moment ago predicted that after election it would be "Governor Dewey, of New York," with emphasis on the word "Governor." Many on our side will agree with him.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has just spoken, referred to Sidney Hillman. Since predictions are in order, I am going to make one. I predict that President Roosevelt will repudiate Sidney Hillman within the next 30 days. It seems to be inevitable. We cannot afford to have a corrupt organization like that of Sidney Hillman's fastened onto the body politic of America. Now since President Roosevelt has found out that Hillman began his political skullduggery back when Mr. Dewey was a candidate for district attorney, in the light of what is going on in the country now, and the resentment of decent American citizens, both he and Governor Dewey are justified in repudiating Sidney Hillman and his entire gang.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I speak today of a wonderful record of achievement. You will recall on Monday that I requested, and was granted unanimous consent, to speak for 30 minutes today. In making the request, I stated that I desired to speak on a few matters which some might construe to be politics. What I shall speak about is a record that every American should be extremely proud of unless he be one who, for various reasons, can see no good coming from the White House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to speak upon the record of achievement of the United States Government during the war and prior to the war. This record that I speak to you of was under the leadership of the President of the United States.

It was in May 1940 that the President called upon the Congress for 50,000 planes and for other materials of war necessary for national defense. It was in the same year that the Selective Service Act was passed. It was the same year that the National Guard of the United States was called into service. There were those who said—and quite a number of them—that we could not manufacture 50,000 planes, for they were thinking of the 800 which were produced in 1938.

Since the first day of July 1940, and up until the first day of August 1944, this country—under the leadership of the President and with the cooperation of industry and labor—has produced 224,805 airplanes.

In addition to this, from July 1, 1940, up to August 1, 1944, the record shows that there has been produced in this country 65,515 tanks; 2,092,500 machine guns; 10,120,000 rifles and carbines; 38,920 motor carriages for self-propelled artillery; 630,000,000 rounds of Army artillery ammunition; 1,973,801 military trucks from January 1, 1940, to August 1, 1944; 83,800 armored cars, scout cars, and carriers through July 1944; 3,522 merchant ships; 993 combat naval ships; 45,296 subsidiary naval ships, including 40,620 landing crafts.

During the past 4 years 11 aircraft carriers of the 10,000-ton converted-cruiser type, as well as 74 aircraft carrier escorts, have been completed.

In 1943 United States shipyards turned out 1,881 vessels for the Maritime Commission, of which 1,238 were the 16-knot and upward Liberty ships. In the first 7 months of 1944, 1,052 new ships have been delivered to the Maritime Commission. From a production standpoint, I think you will agree with me that during the last 4 years production has been simply tremendous in materials of war. I could give you the facts also as to the enormous quantities of textiles that were manufactured in this country—an output which could well be termed enormous. This great production in all lines could not have been had if it had not been for the cooperation of labor and industry with the Government. While there have been some strikes, yet I say to you that the record of American labor is one of which every American should

be proud—whether it was in industry, in transportation, or anything else. Speaking of transportation, the American railways, American coastwise and river shipping, motor busses, trucks, and commercial aviation have transported an immense tonnage of materials of war and supplies as well as many, many millions of passengers. When history is written, the history of transportation will be a most remarkable achievement in this war.

LEND-LEASE

It may interest you to have the figures on lend-lease. The total lend-lease aid to our allies from March 11, 1941, to June 30, 1944, amounts to \$28,270,351,000. In addition to this amount, \$678,241,000 worth of supplies were consigned to United States commanding generals in the field for subsequent lend-lease transfer to Allied forces.

You and I have frequently heard it expressed by unthinking persons that we were not giving enough to our soldiers and too much to our allies. I wanted to find out about this, and I did. I discovered that our armed forces received 82 percent of our production. Our allies received 15 percent of our production under lend-lease and that our allies purchased 3 percent of our total war production. These figures should refute any of these foolish statements.

Now the next thing that should be brought to your attention is that 54 percent of the amount of lend-lease consists of materials of war, ammunition, and ships. Twenty-one percent of what they get consists of industrial material and products. Thirteen percent consists of food and agricultural products, and the remainder of 12 percent consists of services, such as the repair and rental of ships, the ferrying of aircraft, and the building of factories in the United States to produce lend-lease supplies.

The United States has leased 511 cargo ships of 1,000 gross tons or over, and 1,284 merchant and auxiliary craft of under 1,000 gross tons. All ships are leased for the duration of the war only, and they remain the property of the United States.

Every American knows of the gallant fight that has been made by Russia in driving the Nazis from their soil. We Americans can take pride in the courage and fortitude and the great fighting qualities of the Russians, and we also can take pride in the aid which we let Russia have. The total amount of lend-lease to this great country has amounted to \$5,900,000,000, and of that amount \$1,650,000,000 has been shipped to Russia during the first 6 months of 1944.

Three hundred thousand trucks and other military vehicles.

Eighty-four thousand military vehicles were shipped during first 6 months of 1944.

By June 30, 1944, we had sent the Soviet Union 339 locomotives, and 1,649 flatcars under a program begun last year.

By June 30, 1944, we had shipped more than 455,000 tons of railroad rails and accessories, car and locomotive wheels and axles, 934,000 miles of field telephone wire, and 325,000 field telephones.

From October 1, 1941, to June 30, 1944, 11,000 planes have been flown or shipped. Three thousand planes in the first 6 months of 1944.

Three million, seventy-nine thousand short tons of food—this includes 588,000 tons of wheat and flour, 572,000 tons of canned and dried milk, 356,000 tons of vegetable oils, 17,000 tons of seeds, and 7,600,000 pairs of Army boots.

I have, as briefly as possible, tried to impress upon you the great magnitude of the undertaking in which the United States has engaged in this global war. You may be interested in some short statements of facts which will still further impress upon you the magnitude of the undertaking that our Nation has engaged in.

To date, I would estimate that approximately 50,000,000 tons of army cargo has been shipped overseas.

More supplies were shipped to north Africa alone for that invasion than were transported during the entire period of our participation in the last war.

To transport one armored division overseas it requires at least 15 Liberty ships for its equipment as well as the necessary ships for troops in addition.

In World War No. 1, one piece of artillery was produced for every 1,100 soldiers. We now manufacture one for every 46 soldiers.

In 2 weeks of operations in the Marshall Islands the Navy expended 58,800,000 gallons of fuel oil and gasoline. I have been informed that approximately 1 ton of gasoline is required to keep a flying fortress in the air 1 hour.

As a comparison between this war and the Spanish-American War, I call to your attention that in the Battle of Manila Bay in 1898, Dewey's fleet expended 73 tons of shells. At Tarawa, in 1943, naval vessels fired 2,200 tons of shells and our aircraft dropped 500 tons of bombs.

Let me state to you just a part of one Army front-line supply order: 100 pneumatic drills, 60 sheepfoot rollers, 40 pile drivers, 80 rock crushers, 40 power shovels, 200 water pumps, 100 tractors, 100,000 feet of 36-inch metal culvert pipe, 4 shops complete for general service regiment, 235,000 pairs of shoes, 50,000 rounds of mortar ammunition, 100 miles of 4-inch pipe, sedans, wheat, dry batteries, and nurses' overshoes and underwear.

For every 100 rifles the Army sends to combat areas, the annual replacement is 60 rifles. For every 100 machine guns the Army must count on replacements of 85. For every pair of shoes, every helmet, every truck, every shelter half, replacements must be kept flowing.

OIL AND GASOLINE

A tremendous amount of oil and gasoline is used by our armed forces, and we must be pleased with what has been accomplished by the Nation in this field. Without gasoline and oil the Nation would be helpless. For use in tanks, ships, planes, and machines for industries, as well as other things, we require enormous quantities.

Firepower decides battles but remember this—that firepower cannot be obtained without oil.

When General Eisenhower gave his Normandy invasion order, 11,000 planes started whirling. Hundreds of transport planes dropped 24,000 parachute troops behind German lines.

More than 460 domestic refineries are now in operation in this country. The United Nations now have available to them operation facilities which produce more than 500,000 barrels per day of special fuels.

In 30 months of war this Nation has built over 60 domestic plants at a cost of approximately \$1,000,000,000 and production has multiplied more than 10 percent.

Army consumption represents approximately 40 percent of the daily output of gasoline. This is more than 10 times as much as was consumed in the last war.

The total requirements of the United States and her allies at the present time is approximately 7,000,000 barrels daily, or approximately two and one-half billion barrels per year. None of us can conceive of how much—or what size pile—two and one-half billion barrels is, but let me put it this way: If the two and one-half billion barrels were emptied into tank cars and these tank cars were placed into one single train, that train would be 100,000 miles long.

I have touched on some of the high-lights in the production field. I have done this for the specific purpose of reminding you that somebody had to be at the head—somebody had to be the final arbiter, the one that directed all the production and all the transportation, both in this country and abroad. Who was that someone? You and I know that it was the President of the United States. If he had failed in these things, in this campaign he would have been charged with the failure; so in this campaign he and his administration must be given the credit for what has been done. There were many who helped him—men of both parties—men of all groups have cooperated with him; but finally, he alone had to assume the responsibility for this vast undertaking. We can give credit to all but especially must we give credit to the President of the United States.

Again and again I want to remind you, however, that this war is not yet won. No war is ever won until the last shot is fired. Production must go on as called for. Men must be trained as are called for. We must win. We will win a final and complete victory over our enemies.

Having soldiered in the last war, I have had, of course, experience in the training of troops and of being with troops in battle. I believe that I can say without fear of contradiction that never in any country—in any period of history—have the armed forces been mobilized so well and received such training or been so well prepared as they are in this war.

We have an Army of approximately 8,000,000 men. We have a naval personnel, including the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, of approximately 3,250,000 men. We have overseas in the Army and Navy something over 5,000,000. Wherever these men are—wherever they have been—they have measured up to, if not surpassed, the high standard set for them by American soldiers and sailors

of former wars. They have fought as Americans have always done, with initiative and courage—they have endured all privations that a soldier has to endure—and each and every one of them has been a man. In addition to the men, praise of necessity must be given to the nurses of the various armed services and to all of those in the other women's organizations. When victory is finally won and the history of this war is written, it will contain a glorious record of the achievements of our armed forces.

Many of our men have made the supreme sacrifice. Many are wounded for life. Many are missing, and a great many are prisoners of war. The total casualties up to the 1st of September were 389,125.

Wounded, 195,106; missing, 54,565; prisoners, 52,647.

It may be well to give you the British losses. Since September 1939 the battle casualties of the British armed forces were 925,963, in addition to a total of 132,092 British civilians who have been killed or wounded during air raids.

The United States armed forces have been diminished by 1,607,366 officers and men. This total includes all casualties and wounded who have been returned to civilian life as well as those who were discharged for various reasons from the armed services.

Our armed forces are meeting with success. Only the other day we heard over the radio the description of General Brereton's air-borne troops landing in Holland. It was a description that thrilled and filled every American with pride of the American troops.

Up to date Cherbourg and Le Havre have been captured. Yesterday we had the report that Brest has fallen. Antwerp is now in Allied hands and awaits only the clearing out of the Germans between the port and the mouth of the Scheldt. General Patch's army moves closer toward the sealing of the Belfort Gap.

In Italy the Allied troops are striking close to Rimini, key point along the Germans' Gothic Line which guards the approaches to the Po Valley. There is hard fighting and everywhere our troops are engaged they are getting results. The Russians have captured Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, and the siege of Warsaw is underway. Rumania and Bulgaria and Finland are now fighting the Axis. It is clear that it is just a question of time before final victory in Europe.

In the Pacific Saipan and Guam have been conquered. A landing has been made in the Palau group. Another landing has been made on Morotai, northernmost island of the Moluccas, 300 miles from Mindanao.

In southeast Asia Chinese and British troops have long since captured the important Japanese supply base at Mogaung. Allied troops, since the capture of Myitkyina have further tightened their grip on all of north Burma. In Manipur across the Indian border, British and Indian troops have entirely eliminated all Japanese forces.

Each day the picture changes and one to keep abreast must read the papers and listen to the broadcasts. Praise is due the Secretary of War, Mr. Stim-

son, the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, and the other Assistant Secretaries of War, the former Secretary of the Navy, the late Frank Knox, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy for the efficient and patriotic way in which they have done their jobs and in which they have fulfilled every expectation. We, as Americans, can be proud of General Marshal, Admiral King, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and the other great Army and Navy officers who have performed their duties so well.

We must remember, gentlemen, that above all of these there has been a Commander in Chief—the President of the United States—who deserves praise for the part that he has played in hastening victory. President Roosevelt—like the other wartime Presidents—history will record, has magnificently upheld every American tradition and rendered a high degree of patriotic service to the Nation. He has made a great President and as equally a great Commander in Chief.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the remarkable address he has just made and also thank him for the time and energy he has expended in preparing those figures for the benefit of the Members of the House and of the public.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include certain extracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MONROE]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be transferred to tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the completion of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE NATURAL IRRESPONSIBILITY OF INEXPERIENCED YOUTH VERSUS THE ALLEGED WEARINESS OF TIRED OLD AGE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday I indulged in a few comments relative to the outstanding issue

of this campaign as put forth by the Republican nominee and his associates early therein. I commenced my remarks by stating that when this issue was first injected into it I did not consider it a consequential one. But I told my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that I have finally been thoroughly converted to the idea that Governor Dewey's statements on his present tour have thoroughly convinced me of its appropriateness as the main issue of the campaign. I refer, of course, to that paramount issue, the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth versus the weariness of alleged tired old age. In concluding those remarks I stated, after referring to Governor Dewey having waived aside responsible statements from such men with knowledge of the facts as General Marshall; such tired old men as former Supreme Court Justice Byrnes; Acting Chairman Thomas, of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate; and Chairman May, of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and taking the offhand and irresponsible statement of a junior major general who happens to be a Republican, whereas all these other gentlemen were Democrats, on which to base his charge that this administration would keep men in the Army unnecessarily after the war is over; in concluding I charged that Governor Dewey was guilty of one of three errors in making that statement, either of which would be unpardonable. First, that he was guilty of discussing something of which he was entirely ignorant, criticizing it and stating that he would remedy it; or, second, that it merely resulted from the natural irresponsibility of his inexperienced youth; or, third, which I was loathe to believe and would not then believe, that it was a deliberate effort to mislead the people of America and play on the heartstrings of the sad and lonely mothers, wives, sweethearts, sisters, and daughters of our soldiers for political purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the conference report, which the House adopted today, in section 201, it provides:

The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

That is congressional action, in addition to the general order of the War Department; and this matter has been under consideration in one form or another by committees of the House and Senate since last June.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much for that contribution. He will recall that Justice Byrnes told a press conference in June that the orderly release of our fighting men at the earliest possible moment consistent with the war effort will be the primary consideration of both the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but you see, he is a tired old man.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. TABER. Why was it then that the person in charge of Selective Service, General Hershey, was not kept within better bounds?

Mr. JARMAN. I imagine he is an irresponsible Republican youth who has been placed in a position of too great responsibilities by the War Department, but demobilization is not one of those responsibilities. He is an Army officer and this administration does not punish Army officers for political purposes.

Mr. TABER. Well, but the gentleman said he was a youth. He is an old man, as old as I am.

Mr. JARMAN. Well, the gentleman from New York is a youth.

Mr. TABER. And a great deal older than the gentleman from Alabama, who is speaking.

Mr. JARMAN. The distinguished gentleman from New York is very young himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder how my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] feels with reference to the expression "tired old man," because I certainly never considered him tired; but it must have been rather embarrassing to him to have the leader of his own party use that phrase.

Mr. JARMAN. I have never seen any evidence of weariness on the part of the gentleman from New York. On the other hand, he is always exceptionally alert, sometimes too much so.

Mr. TABER. "Tired" represents the condition of the subject. I never claimed to be in that class, but where the coat fits, generally you have to put it on.

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will remain, I am going to mention him again directly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I will yield briefly to my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, after which I must proceed or I will be unable to conclude my remarks.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wanted to say that nearly everybody in Washington knows that General Hershey has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the discharging of any person in the armed services, but that is purely the function of the Army and the Navy. General Hershey's jurisdiction absolutely ends the minute a person is sworn in, and Governor Dewey should know that fact.

Mr. JARMAN. He is charged with that responsibility. His position charges him with it, and I believe practically everyone in America except Governor Dewey is aware that what you say is quite true. Of course, Justice Byrnes and these others do have responsibility for it. Furthermore, he is sufficiently close to the President to be frequently referred to as Assistant President, whereas Hershey is a Republican.

No paper I have read, no commentator I have heard, no Member of Congress I have heard refer to the matter, has commended Governor Dewey for bringing demobilization into the campaign. On

the other hand, he has been generally criticized. Certainly he must have heard of some of that criticism. Yet last Saturday he repeated it in an interview. Consequently, difficult though it be for me to realize and although I dislike to do it, I must eliminate the first two alternatives and reluctantly reach the conclusion that Governor Dewey was indulging in the last alternative that I mentioned when he brought that into the campaign. That is playing on the heartstrings of the Nation for political purposes.

Since then, of course, he has continued with his ridiculously irresponsible remarks. For instance, Secretary Ickes and Secretary Perkins vying for top positions on the purge list. Did anybody ever hear of a Republican President retaining a single member of his Democratic predecessor's Cabinet, or vice versa? Is it not the normal, the regular, the reasonable, the proper procedure for a new President if he is of a different party from his predecessor to appoint an entirely new Cabinet? And why talk irresponsibly and ridiculously about a purge list for Cabinet members?

He referred to General MacArthur. I have seen no compliment anywhere, nor have I heard of his desire to take charge of the war effort and say what the general should do. I have two columns about it, which are merely illustrative of all the comments, from each of which I will read excerpts; and I ask unanimous content, Mr. Speaker, to insert the two articles at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 16, 1944]

DEWEY AND WAR COMMAND

(By Maj. George Fielding Elliot)

Governor Dewey has contributed greatly to our national unity in the matter of post-war foreign policy, and to the confidence of our allies in our future intentions regarding the enforcement of the common peace, by his very evident determination to lift these vital questions above the level of partisan debate.

For this the country may well be grateful to the Republican candidate. His course in this respect seems to this writer to be wise, unselfish, and statesmanlike, but his gratuitous interference in the matter of the high command in the Pacific is neither wise nor helpful.

In his statement at Valentine, Nebr., on September 13, Governor Dewey brought forward the name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in such a way as to render unavoidable the conclusion that the Governor was urging the appointment of that officer to the over-all Pacific command. In so doing, he ventured into a field which he is not qualified to discuss either on the ground of information or that of responsibility.

Governor Dewey cannot possibly know the facts as to General MacArthur's accomplishments and abilities, as displayed in the present war, except as these have been reported in the press or as they are told to him by persons of varying degrees of military competence who have visited the Southwest Pacific. He does not have access to the only source of information and advice on this subject which would enable him to pass judgment on General MacArthur as a possible

over-all Pacific commander in chief. Those sources are to be found in the Combined Chiefs of Staff, under whose direction General MacArthur functions, and to whom he is responsible.

Governor Dewey said, as quoted by correspondents: "Any study of his [MacArthur's] offensives up from Australia reveals the most extraordinary brilliance of his generalship. Time after time he has made landings on heavily defended, long prepared islands, and almost every time he has managed to land at the exact spot where the Japanese were not."

It is perfectly true, of course, that General MacArthur has conducted a skillful campaign and has gained distance toward his objectives in a steady step-by-step advance which has now brought him to the Halmahera Islands. But the inevitable implication of the Governor's remarks is that General MacArthur has handled his part of the eastward march toward Japan more skillfully than others—more skillfully, for example, than Admiral Nimitz has handled his great Central Pacific offensive.

In this writer's judgment—and that of other observers, it may be added—this is most decidedly not the case.

The Governor suggests that "adequate recognition and supply commensurate with General MacArthur's great talents are long overdue." But the supply of the Southwest Pacific area is a part of the general supply problem in the Pacific, which is based on the proportion of the total war resources available on the American forces which can, in view of the over-all strategic picture be allotted to the Pacific campaign.

In the beginning of that campaign General MacArthur was undoubtedly very short of supplies, men, planes, and everything else. So were all the rest of our Pacific forces. The decision to dispose of Germany first and Japan second was the reason. The vast offensive power of which we now dispose in the Pacific was not there then. It had to be built up by slow, heartbreaking, painful effort, and meanwhile those who fought to hold back the enemy's offensive thrusts had to do the best they could with what they had plus the trickle of help that could reach them. MacArthur did that; Halsey did that; the marines at Guadalcanal did that, and they all did it well.

Now things are different, very different. Germany is going down. Japan's turn is coming. Governor Dewey is not well informed in suggesting that General MacArthur lacks the forces and the equipment which he requires for the accomplishment of his present objectives. The very facts of MacArthur's recent progress tend to put this matter in quite another light than does Governor Dewey.

As to the suggestion that General MacArthur should now be appointed commander in chief of the whole Pacific war effort—and surely, despite careful hedging, Mr. Dewey could hardly have imagined that his words would be otherwise interpreted—it seems difficult to suppose that the Governor could have given any great study to the strategic conditions which now confront the Allied forces, or he would have realized that for a long time to come the war against Japan must continue primarily a naval and amphibious campaign in which everything depends on the Navy, in which sea-borne power is the foundation upon which the whole structure of our offensive operations must rest.

It is, of course, true that we are now coming to larger land masses, that we shall need more troops, that land operations will assume a higher proportionate importance, but we are still fighting for islands, even though they are bigger islands than Tarawa or Salpan, and we are very far as yet from the day when our principal objective will be the de-

struction of the main Japanese Army, in a great land campaign.

Until that day has been reached or is clearly in sight, the chief command of the Pacific operations ought to remain in the hands of a naval officer. Neither by his own experience nor by having access to adequately informed professional advice is Governor Dewey qualified to say otherwise.

[From the Washington Post of September 17, 1944]

MACARTHUR'S NOT ABUSED, SAYS WRITER (By Ernest Lindley)

The charge that General MacArthur has been discriminated against because the President regarded him as a political threat has been made familiar by the isolationist press.

Now Governor Dewey has picked it up. He says that MacArthur should be given greater scope and recognition and more supplies.

What greater scope and recognition should General MacArthur be given? For 2½ years he has been Allied commander in the southwest Pacific, an area which embraces the approaches to the Philippines from Australia and New Guinea.

The next step up would be commander in chief of all Pacific operations.

These operations are, at the core, naval. Can anyone deny that they have been brilliantly conducted under the direction of Admirals King and Nimitz? Does anyone think that any general could conduct them any better, or even as well? Ask any naval officer.

Some sort of joint command might be rigged up. But that would be a dangerous step backward.

The only other posts which are more important than the one already held by MacArthur are chief of staff of the Army and supreme commander of Allied forces in Europe.

Does any sane person really think that General Marshall should be replaced, or, for that matter, General Eisenhower?

WILL REDEEM PLEDGE

If the defeat of Japan requires large-scale use of ground forces in China or in Japan proper, an Army general probably will be placed in command of them. If the Philippines have been liberated, meanwhile, General MacArthur might be named to such a command; although if there is a major campaign in China, General Stilwell, who speaks Chinese and is, among other things, chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, presumably would be considered for this responsibility.

General Eisenhower, who has proved so skillful in handling of forces of diverse nationality, also might be available.

But, meanwhile, General MacArthur is well on his way back to the Philippines for the redemption of his pledge to liberate them. That in itself is a large and honorable task and one that it is altogether fitting that he should perform.

As to supplies, it is well known that they are distributed in accordance with the strategic decisions of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Those available for the Pacific have been distributed under the direction of the American Chiefs of Staff.

TWO BASIC REASONS

When MacArthur first began shouting for more supplies, more planes, and more of everything, he was probably no worse off relatively than other theater commanders. The main difference was that he made his demands more or less in public, whereas the others went through channels.

The hard fact in early 1942 was that there were not enough planes, supplies, and men to go around or enough ships to carry them.

As time passed there were two basic reasons why MacArthur did not receive all that he wanted. The first was the combined Anglo-American decision to beat Germany first. This was taken by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill with the full support of General Marshall.

The Navy's attitude was mixed.

This was probably the most critical decision of the war. It was the one which evoked the strongest protests from isolationist quarters and, with the loss of the Philippines, generated the boom to make General MacArthur Chief of Staff, or commander in chief of all American forces. Its essential wisdom is hardly debatable any more, even though some of the individual subdecisions—such as the sacrificing of a larger and earlier campaign to Burma to the defensive in Italy—are open to challenge.

SUPPLIES NOW ADEQUATE

The second basic reason why MacArthur did not get all he thought he should have was that his views on Pacific strategy did not altogether jibe with the Navy's. The Navy was working toward the great march across the central Pacific.

MacArthur has had in recent months adequate forces to perform the tasks assigned to him. Unquestionably he will be given enough for the next jump on his route. In fact, some naval officers feared that when Roosevelt went to Pearl Harbor he might make verbal commitments to MacArthur to provide forces in excess of those tentatively allotted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thus possibly delaying or weakening the main drive across the central Pacific.

Dewey's criticism of the treatment of MacArthur is, although he may not know it, a fundamental criticism of the wisdom of the American Chiefs of Staff.

In his acceptance speech he said he was against civilian interference with the conduct of the war and that, if elected, he would retain General Marshall and Admiral King.

Now he sets himself up as a man whose judgment on matters of military strategy is superior to theirs.

Mr. JARMAN. I quote from the conclusion of Ernest Lindley's column in the Washington Post of September 17:

Dewey's criticism of the treatment of MacArthur is, although he may not know it (in the irresponsibility of his youth), a fundamental criticism of the wisdom of the American Chiefs of Staff. In his acceptance speech he said he was against "civilian interference" with the conduct of the war and that if elected he would retain General Marshall and Admiral King.

Now he sets himself up as a man whose judgment on matters of military strategy is superior to theirs.

I also quote briefly from Maj. George Fielding Eliot, a military man, in the Star of September 16:

Governor Dewey is not well informed in suggesting that General MacArthur lacks the forces and the equipment which he requires for the accomplishment of his present objective. The very fact of MacArthur's recent progress tends to prove this matter in quite another light than does Governor Dewey.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will excuse me, I am afraid I am not going to get through in the time at my disposal. I hope to have an opportunity to yield later.

Governor Dewey, of course, would not know anything more about war than he would about demobilization. I will say this in his behalf, however: His analysts,

his people who read the papers for him, have told him about the criticism of his irresponsible reference to MacArthur because I believe it was Monday night he made the statement again that if he were elected there would be no change in military leadership. He is learning at least to that extent and I congratulate him on it.

But most ridiculous of all—and all of you recognized that fact who heard his speech Monday night—was when he said—and I quote from the press verbatim:

That law, the Smith-Connally Act, will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and the other New Deal interferences with free collective bargaining will never be renewed.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first time I ever heard my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], referred to as a new dealer; nor do I recall ever having heard Senator CONNALLY showered with such references. Do you believe it is possible, my colleagues on the left, that Governor Dewey did not know that the New Deal was absolutely opposed to that legislation to such an extent that the President vetoed it and that it was passed in this House over his veto with a great many Republican votes for it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield for just a brief question?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman remember that it was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] who offered the substitute plan here on the floor which was adopted by the House?

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. That is true, and he is a good Republican.

Mr. Speaker, did the Governor of New York, and I think he will remain Governor of New York for 2 more years, know that the following outstanding new dealers voted to override the President's veto and therefore contributed toward the passage of the bill:

That outstanding new dealer, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, assistant minority leader [Mr. MICHENER], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the minority whip [Mr. ARENDT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUDSON], ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the honorable gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who placed Mr. Willkie in nomination at Chicago 4 years ago.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And if the gentleman will yield, Mr. HALLECK was also chairman of the Republican National Congressional Committee.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; also chairman of the Republican National Congressional Committee. And, finally, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who was Governor Bricker's floor leader at Chicago this time.

As a matter of fact, I wonder if he did not know, and if he did not I charge him with the responsibility of having been able to know—he should have known—that the ranking Republican of no major committee failed to vote to override that veto? Only 7 ranking minority members of minor committees so voted, and only 36 Republicans out of the more than 200 were among the 108 who voted against the Smith-Connally act.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. It seems too bad that Governor Dewey does not take into account the feelings of our distinguished Republican colleagues.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes, indeed. Of course, it makes his references last night absolutely ridiculous, ludicrous, and irresponsible in the extreme. I refer to his talk about cooperation between the Chief Executive and the Congress when he treats his own people, all of whom are running for reelection, that way. I say to him that is some cooperation. However, his attitude toward his own interests, his own opinions, as compared with those of others, is quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, having already convicted himself to my complete satisfaction on the demobilization matter, I repeat the charge with reference to this MacArthur, and particularly the Smith-Connally matter, that Governor Dewey in making those statements was guilty of one of three errors, either of which is far beneath the position he occupies and the position his party has unfortunately for its members, placed him in. Either he was absolutely ignorant about the whole Smith-Connally bill, how it was passed, who voted for it, who sponsored it, and who fought it, with which he should have been familiar before he began to criticize people and tell the country that he was going to do better. Or it was just another illustration of the natural irresponsibility of inexperienced youth that flits about like a butterfly from flower to flower, indulging in indiscriminate charges, claiming everything, attempting to be all things to all people all the time everywhere, either one of those two, or Governor Dewey was deliberately attempting to mislead the people of this country, and particularly the laboring people, in his search for votes.

Think of it, my colleagues. Think of his lack of confidence in their judgment. Think of the respect he showed the laboring men last night when he said to them:

You do not know anything about this Smith-Connally bill that you have been talking about for 6 months. You do not know who voted for it or who sponsored it. I, the

great Governor of New York, am charged with all knowledge on that matter, and you little, insignificant laboring people, in whom I have no interest whatever except in your votes, I will tell you about it.

I ask you, my colleagues, and I ask the people of America, whether a candidate for President who has been guilty of such errors, regardless of their prompting cause, is the least bit capable, the least bit competent, the least bit worthy of presiding over the destinies of this great country at any time, and certainly at such a critical period as this?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when the last deficiency bill providing funds for the O. P. A. was up, the Appropriations Committee adopted an amendment, and the House and Senate followed through, restricting O. P. A. operations on canned fruits and vegetables to commercial grades and prohibiting the Administrator of O. P. A. from establishing other grades.

Mr. Bowles has seen fit to make certain statements in a letter to Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee with reference to this amendment.

Agricultural Marketing Administration grades have been established by the Agricultural Department with reference to canned fruits and vegetables. These are not in general use. It is absolutely impossible for canners and processors to accurately reflect the true grade according to A. M. A. The commercial grades have been in effect for 60 years and there has never been any difficulty with reference to their interpretation or use.

Mr. Bowles states in his letter that the proviso which prohibits the use of anything other than commercial grades "made impossible the proper enforcement of price ceilings on canned fruits and vegetables."

In his letter Mr. Bowles gives no facts about enforcement. He states no instance or instances in which the O. P. A. found it difficult to enforce maximum prices based on established commercial grades. Likewise, he gives no instance or instances in which the O. P. A.'s improper use of A. M. A. grades in 1943 made enforcement easier or better.

Of course whatever facts are available, O. P. A. has in its Enforcement Division headed by Mr. Emerson. The failure to advance any facts in an 11-page statement issued by Mr. Bowles in and of itself would make one suspicious as to the existence of such facts.

What information is available outside the O. P. A. leads to very grave doubts

as to the accuracy or candor of what Mr. Bowles has said.

In 1942 O. P. A. pricing was based on established commercial grades rather than these Government grades. According to information available to me, O. P. A. had little difficulty in enforcing these regulations. In numerous instances it secured treble-damage settlements, in one instance in the Middle West it obtained injunctions against violation of the price ceilings, and in a pending California case it has brought a very large treble-damage suit based on price regulations according to established commercial grades.

In an affidavit filed by Mr. Tom Emerson, Deputy Administrator for Enforcement, in November 1943, he reported that there had been 308 investigations of alleged price violations in the sale of processed foods of the 1942 pack, which were priced according to commercial grades, and that out of this total of 308, sanctions had been imposed in 139 cases. By sanctions I suppose he means either treble-damage settlements or successful court action. This seems to me to be rather effective enforcement, and far better than the average.

It is not necessary, however, to make one's own judgment because Prentiss Brown, the former O. P. A. Administrator, himself, has summed up O. P. A.'s experience in 1942 under regulations based on commercial grades.

In an opinion rendered on February 27, 1943, Prentiss Brown stated, regarding the operation of the canning industry under MPR 152 during the 1942 pack:

It is a matter of record that the great majority of approximately 3,000 canners have been, and are, operating successfully under price control. In view of this fact, it must be apparent that the regulation is generally fair and equitable and by arresting the upward trend of prices, has effectuated the purpose of the act. (In the matter of C. S. Kale Canning Co., opinion on order No. 20 under Reg. MPR 152, Feb. 27, 1943.)

In 1943 some of the O. P. A. prices were based on commercial grades and some others on these Government grades, which legally the O. P. A. even then had no right to use. Numerous instances have been reported in which the O. P. A. has obtained damage settlements against processors based on these commercial grades. In one case in May 1944, in my own State an applesauce canner was made to pay \$20,960.50 in settlement of a treble-damage suit covering sales of applesauce—Hartman Canning Co., Macedon, N. Y., on the 1943 pack based on commercial grades.

In another case involving a Baltimore processor, very substantial sums were obtained in a treble-damage settlement of alleged violations of price regulations which were based on these established commercial grades—Gibbs & Co. The charges were that they had upgraded their product and there was no difficulty in O. P. A.'s enforcement.

These are only some among many instances of effective enforcement using commercial grades which undoubtedly led Mr. Bowles' predecessor, Prentiss Brown, to make the statement which I have quoted.

Whether these facts have been reported to Mr. Bowles by his enforcement staff, I do not know. They certainly lead me to believe that if there was a willingness to proceed with the enforcement of price regulations based on established commercial grades—instead of this insistence upon seeking to do what Congress has prohibited—effective enforcement could be readily secured.

On the other side of the picture I very greatly doubt the honesty of the statement that with these A. M. A. grades O. P. A. could do a better enforcement job. In 1943 some 10 processed fruits and vegetables were priced according to these A. M. A. grades. These included the most important products. Most, if not all, of this 1943 pack has long since been sold by the processors. Most of it was sold before last January.

Yet not one single court case or treble-damage settlement has been reported in which the O. P. A. successfully prosecuted on the basis of these A. M. A. grades. At a meeting last July between the Deputy Administrator for Price and the processors, O. P. A. enforcement lawyers were asked to state what had been O. P. A. experience in price enforcement using these A. M. A. grades. These lawyers could produce nothing, they had no figures, and they could point to no completed case in which A. M. A. grades had served effectively in enforcement.

Throughout this entire controversy, the O. P. A. has failed to produce any facts supporting their insistence upon upsetting the established methods of doing business in the industry.

It is apparent to me that with the difficulty of interpreting the Agricultural Marketing Administration grades which are very difficult to understand and to follow through, that enforcement would be much more difficult and practically impossible if Mr. Bowles were allowed to have his own way.

Why does he not try to do the thing with which he has succeeded, instead of trying to impose some additional regulation which will tend to prevent proper enforcement?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not hear all the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama

[Mr. JARMAN] when he spoke and criticized Governor Dewey for his views on labor, and particularly in connection with the Smith-Connally bill. The responsibility for legislation in the House of Representatives which has a Democratic majority, must necessarily rest with that party. They control the committees and they control the procedure in the House and they have a majority vote. The Smith-Connally bill was sponsored by two Democrats. No one can deny that. One is a Member of this House and another a Member of the Senate. They are two very distinguished Members of their respective Houses. I thoroughly agree with the views expressed by Governor Dewey when he said in his Seattle speech on September 18, 1944:

The law, the Smith-Connally Act, will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and other New Deal interferences with free, collective bargaining should never be renewed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield; certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman understand that he was criticizing the passage of the Smith-Connally Act?

Mr. FISH. I understand from what I could gather of the speech of the gentleman from Alabama that he was criticizing Governor Dewey on that ground also.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman should have been here. The gentleman from Alabama was criticizing Governor Dewey in trying to create the impression that the Smith-Connally Act was New Deal legislation. Now Governor Dewey condemned the act, the passage of it. Did the gentleman from New York vote for the passage of the bill over the veto of the President?

Mr. FISH. That is just what I am coming to, to tell the gentleman the situation at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman did, he defended him.

Mr. FISH. I understood he criticized Governor Dewey for stating that he condemned the act.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; he criticized Governor Dewey for claiming that it was New Deal legislation when, of course, everyone knows that it was not. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. FISH. I thought you just said, or at least I heard you say, that he criticized Governor Dewey for condemning the act itself?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is, that Governor Dewey claimed that it was New Deal legislation. Well, then, Governor Dewey condemned the act.

Mr. FISH. We agree on that, that Governor Dewey condemned the act.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that.

Mr. FISH. That is why I intend to defend him from unjustifiable criticism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Governor Dewey also tried to create the impression that it was New Deal legislation.

Mr. FISH. That is secondary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; it is not secondary; that is primary. It may be secondary to you.

Mr. FISH. You admit that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] stated that Governor Dewey condemned the Smith-Connally bill or act.

Mr. McCORMACK. And Governor Dewey tried to charge it was New Deal legislation; that is primary.

Mr. FISH. No; it is not primary. Has he not a right to condemn the act and was he not right in doing so?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course he has, but he does not have a right to claim it was New Deal legislation because that is inconsistent with the truth.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes because I want to continue this argument a little further.

Mr. McCORMACK. When he condemned the act he condemned all those who voted to pass the bill over the veto of the President. I asked the gentleman from New York, Did he vote to pass the bill over the President's veto?

Mr. FISH. That is exactly why I took this time, to make the statement that I thoroughly agree that Governor Dewey is right in his condemnation of the act, and that I was wrong on certain phases in the consideration of that legislation. Confession is good for the soul. If the gentleman can recollect that far back he will remember that as ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, I led the fight not to take up the Smith-Connally bill, but urged the defeat of the rule, so that the bill could not be considered at that time, because it was being brought up in the midst of the miners' strike. I knew of the pressure and hysteria that existed, and I thought it was utterly unfair to consider that type of legislation then. The gentleman from Massachusetts voted for the rule to take it up. I tried to prevent it being brought up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Massachusetts himself, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman did not vote for the passage of the bill in the House.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman voted to take the bill up. I was trying to prevent the bill being brought up. I tried to prevent it being brought up at that time in the midst of the miners strike, because I knew of the hysteria that existed and that it would not receive fair consideration. The rule was passed by a very small majority, and the gentleman from Massachusetts helped pass the rule to bring it up at that time. Now, that is the gentleman's record. I tried to prevent it being brought up. Then I voted for the bill after it was amended in the House. I voted against it when it came back with the Senate amendments, and then I later voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that is when it became law.

Mr. FISH. That is when it became law. Many months ago I signed the petition to repeal the Smith-Connally Act. That signature was attached many months ago. I believe that Governor Dewey is thoroughly justified in opposing this legislation, in opposing the enactment of it, and in saying that it is bad

legislation, because it has worked that way and has created strikes. Some of us who voted that way regret the vote. I am not ashamed to say that I regret that vote. I was just on the border-line. I think it was that hysteria about the miners' strike that brought me over. I suspected it might work out badly. As I said, I actually led the fight on the floor of the House not to bring it up under the rule, but to defeat the rule. I have no apologies for my vote. I voted the way I wanted to vote at the time, but I was not very keen about it and I was rather fearful of it, and it worked out the way I feared it would. Therefore, I have done the only thing I could do about it, and that is to sign the petition for repeal. I signed that petition many months ago. That type of legislation has not worked out well and Governor Dewey is thoroughly justified in what he said.

Now, as to the primary responsibility, I do not say it is New Deal legislation. I say the Democrats are in charge of the House. They sponsored the legislation in the committee. They were the authors of the legislation in the House and in the Senate. It was passed by a large majority, both Republicans and Democrats. Naturally, the majority leader is the last person to try to deny Democratic responsibility for legislation in this House. I charge that the Democrats are responsible for that legislation and all other legislation that passes the House of Representatives in their own name. They are in control of the House organization and cannot evade that responsibility and obligation.

Call it New Deal legislation or Democratic legislation or what you will, I do not think it is justifiable for anyone to criticize Governor Dewey for his views on the Smith-Connally Act in view of the way it worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing several bills to which I desire to call attention. One provides for the release of married enlisted men from active service in the United States Army who have attained the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth within 30 days of the termination of the war with Germany. I believe that all those married men over 35 years of age in the Army should be given priority and preference of returning to their families and their businesses. They are the forgotten men of the war. They were taken away from their families, their homes, and their children, and from the businesses they built up over 10 or 15 years and had large investments in, some of them making three, four, five, and ten thousand dollars a year. They were thrown into the service, and those overage men have filled our hospitals. It seems to me that when the war with Germany is terminated these men should be given priority in being released first to get back to their families and their children and to save their businesses. I think it makes sense and I hope if the War Department does not act accordingly that the Congress will when it comes back after the recess.

I also am introducing a bill to establish a game farm in Orange County, N. Y., a regular-type game farm for the propagating and distributing of game

birds and animals in that area, the cost not to exceed \$50,000.

Orange County, N. Y., is a large farming county within 50 to 75 miles of New York City. There is enough game for their own purposes and in the shooting season for the sportsmen who live in Orange County—and there are many of them; but at our doorstep is the great city of New York and part of New Jersey, with a population of about 20,000,000 people. They come up into our area and shoot off our game. If that is to continue, I feel that at least the National Government should establish a game farm there to take care of these people who live outside of our country and district who come up every year and hunt in Orange County, come in such numbers that they actually endanger the lives of our people and kill off our pheasants, rabbits, and other game.

I am also introducing a bill to establish 2 fish hatcheries, 1 in Sullivan County on the Neversink River, the other in Delaware County on the Delaware River. There is some of the best fishing in America in Sullivan and Delaware Counties, but the people of New York City and New Jersey come up every year in large numbers to fish in our streams and lakes. We welcome them—in some of our counties they are the best crop we have; they spend their money there. But on the other hand they catch a large part of our fish and we think we ought to have some help from the Federal Government in establishing fish hatcheries right there so that we can take care of our own people in our own counties, but also the thousands upon thousands that come from the city of New York to fish in our district—over 500,000 come annually into Sullivan County—not to fish but for a summer vacation and many of them do fish.

Mr. Speaker, I received the following telegram, and this being almost the last day of Congress I want to get it into the RECORD. It is dated yesterday from Chicago and comes from Philip S. Levy, of Newburgh, N. Y., a delegate to the American Legion national convention at Chicago. It reads as follows:

National Americanism reports unanimously adopted including repeal of Omaha resolution No. 296 relative to franking privilege.

Some of you Members of Congress who read the newspapers about a year ago when the American Legion was in session will remember there were big columns in the newspapers in reference to a resolution passed by the American Legion condemning me for alleged misuse of my franking privilege. It went into details, all kinds of various charges, without ever having given me an opportunity to deny the charges. The resolution was adopted without any substantiating evidence of any kind. I am a member of the Legion. I believe it is a great patriotic organization, courageous, fearless, and when it makes a mistake it is not afraid to say so.

The national executive committee of the American Legion appointed a committee of three to investigate these charges, and did investigate them for

many months' time, and submitted a 12-page report refuting every single one of the charges in every detail. The Legion national convention yesterday passed a resolution exonerating and vindicating me of all these charges and did the unusual thing of rescinding and revoking their position of a year ago and wiping it out completely. Naturally I am proud of that act. But you do not see anything about that in the newspapers. You saw a great deal about it when the charges were first made by the Legion, but when a repudiation of it comes, when it is revoked after a thorough, detailed investigation, you see almost nothing in the papers. I have looked at two or three of the leading newspapers. For instance, I looked at the early edition of the New York Times today which had a whole column about the action of the Legion in condemning me a year ago, but not one word about the refutation and exoneration. That is a great newspaper, it is one of the greatest newspapers in America. My people read it, but they will not see anything in that paper about the action of the national convention of the American Legion repudiating by unanimous vote their action of a year ago.

I have just done the same thing on the floor of the House, and I am not a bit ashamed in saying that I regard my vote for the Smith-Connally Act as a mistake. I think the bill worked out badly. That is all I can do about it, and that is all the Legion can do about it as far as this particular resolution is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a circular from the National Citizens Political Action Committee in which there is taken to task a number of Members of the House and of the Senate, including such distinguished Members as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader; the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and others, as well as a number of Senators. There is a whole paragraph devoted to a special reference to me, and I am very honored, because, I believe condemnation from Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. is the highest possible commendation; at least it is in my congressional district.

Mr. Sidney Hillman admitted before a congressional committee that the P. A. C. contributed \$2,000 to my opponent in the recent primary campaign, which contribution is the kiss of death for the election when the people are made acquainted with the facts, as they will, that my opponent received \$2,000 from Sidney Hillman. The result will be exactly the same as the recent congressional elections in Maine.

Mr. Speaker, this country belongs to the American people and they do not propose to let Sidney Hillman run the United States of America. The American people are Americans, they are American at heart, they are American in soul, body, and mind, and they have no use for any Russianized propaganda emanating from Sidney Hillman to Russianize America. They want nothing to do with the Communists or their fellow travelers such as the American Labor Party and Sidney Hillman's Political Action Com-

mittee. The American people do not propose to let a coalition of these evil and Red forces elect a Congress which they can dominate and control.

Here is what Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. has to say about me, and I want to comment for a few minutes on these charges. Its official pamphlet states that I, Representative FISH, returning from a talk with Van Ribbentrop, announced that the German claims were just. That is a complete misstatement of fact. I never discussed German claims with Von Ribbentrop. The statement referred to here evidently was made long afterwards when I said that the German claims to Danzig, in my opinion, were just. I have always thought that. I thought it then and I think so now. But that is how such statements are twisted around to mean the opposite.

Then it goes on to say, "Representative FISH has spoken at meetings of Bundists." I have never spoken or been invited to speak at any meeting of Bundists. I will give anybody \$1,000 to show where I ever spoke at any meeting of Bundists in my life. I spoke at a German Day rally in 1938, but the Bundists refused to come and boycotted the meeting because of some reference I had made at that time to persecution by Hitler.

Only a little while ago I was attacked in my district as being a bosom friend of Fritz Kuhn, who was the leader of the Bundists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The Communists, the Reds, the American Labor Party, dominated and controlled by the Communists, the liberal party of pinker shade, and Sidney Hillman P. A. C. circulated all over my district material to the effect that Fritz Kuhn, as Bundist leader, was an intimate associate of mine. What are the facts? I met Fritz Kuhn once in my life. I met him in 1938 when I was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the State constitutional convention, where I had put in a resolution to prohibit the arming, the drilling, and the uniforming of the bund and other like organizations. We held open hearings in the assembly chamber, almost as large as this Chamber, and I presided. Fritz Kuhn came there to oppose my resolution to put the bund practically out of business, to prevent it from arming, drilling, and uniforming. Some photographer took a picture of Fritz Kuhn and myself at that meeting, and 100,000 copies were sent out reading—Congressman FISH associated with Fritz Kuhn the Bundist leader—a man I never had seen in my life before or since, but who came there to oppose the resolution I introduced and tried to get through to put his organization out of business. This P. A. C. continues to spread those types of lies and falsehoods and wicked and malicious propaganda that I attend-

ed bund meetings when there is no foundation whatever for such statements.

Only yesterday the Legion put an end to these charges of the alleged abuse of my franking privileges. I have repeatedly stated that no one has used my franking privilege except myself, and that has been for my own speeches, 100 percent American. They were in favor of keeping out of war before Pearl Harbor, but they were 100 percent American. Now the American Legion comes out in national convention and after a thorough investigation admits that there was no violation or abuse of my franking privilege.

As far as Sidney Hillman's P. A. C. is concerned, they have a perfect right to come up into my district and spend all the money they want, but my people are not for sale, Republicans or Democrats alike; and the more Sidney Hillman and his P. A. C. comes into my district with his slush funds the bigger vote I will get, both of Republicans and Democrats on election day. We will make Maine look like a piker if he persists in this kind of vicious and false propaganda and sends money and slush funds into the Twenty-ninth Congressional District. I want this Congress to know that our people can deal with Sidney Hillman and his P. A. C. and the American Labor Party dominated and controlled by the Communists and all their slush funds. The people of my district are not for sale and do not intend to let outsiders like Sidney Hillman dictate to them whom they shall elect to represent them in Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

A FREE PRESS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, the insidious forces of evil must of necessity be veiled with what appears to be good intent or completely shrouded by the darkness of secrecy in order that they may thrive and grow. It is my profound conviction that where the light of truth may be cast upon any movement, wherever it may be on the face of this earth, it will be refined to a constructive force or will be destroyed by this light.

I want to lend my complete cooperation in full approval to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which intends that a free press shall be a condition of the peace among the nations of the world. I do not believe there is full realization and appreciation as to what this resolution, if adopted and approved by the nations of the world, will do toward the establishment of a permanent peace. Its force rises above the intrigue and chicanery that must necessarily precede a war as devastating as the last two wars in which this Nation has participated, because it seeks out the ulterior motives in the hearts of men or nations that would sell either other men or other nations to the gods of war and destruction who are bent upon conquest and power. I have an avowed faith in the public press when its rights to seek out the truth of the iniquitous forces are unhindered and untrammelled.

I believe if the power of the press is privileged by the authorities among the nations, more especially the leading ones, that tyrants and despots will fear it far more greatly than the most formidable force of arms yet known to man. It will take from the hearts and minds of all men the fear of those forces which grow within the walls of restriction by censorship set up to cover an embryonic evil which would wilt and die beneath the searching truth. It gives security to the human heart in the knowledge that they may know the truth, and knowing the truth will formulate an irresistible force for fair dealing among the nations of the world. A free and untrammelled press is the foundation of liberty. Where the expression of truth exists, liberty and freedom within the law will always remain unrestricted. If this movement toward a free press throughout the world is adopted, then I know of no words that can better express its worth than those in the Battle Hymn of the Republic:

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming
of the Lord!
He is trampling out the vintage where the
grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His
terrible swift sword:
His truth is marching on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE CAMPAIGN OF THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I followed with a great deal of interest the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] and I found myself in rather full accord with the views that he expressed here in the well of the House earlier today.

As the Republican candidate for the Presidency completes his first campaign tour, he has emerged with a political strategy and a forensic tactic which, in the midst of war, seem all the more irresponsible for their studied calculation.

The strategy is to sow disaffection with the conduct of the war.

The tactic is to say nothing constructive, to be all things to all men.

I have come to this conclusion regretfully. The Republican candidate had an unrivaled opportunity to play a constructive role in clarifying both the Republican Party and the people of this country on the major problems of war and peace facing America in this critical period. He seeks to become President of the greatest Nation in the world, in the most momentous period in all the history of the world. It would be difficult indeed to imagine a greater opportunity.

I regret that thus far he has chosen not to accept this opportunity. I regret that he chose instead the path of deliberately sowing confusion and doubt in a nation engaged in its most bitter war. I regret that despite high-sounding words and a masterful presence, he has chosen the part of the catch-penny politician greedy for votes, and not the role of statesman which the times demand.

From the purely partisan standpoint, I should, I suppose, welcome this demonstrated insufficiency of the opposing party's candidate for the tasks of the Presidency. On the contrary, I do not. I can take no partisan pleasure in the sowing of confusion, in the raising of doubts in the minds and hearts of Americans in wartime, in the fanning of wartime irritations to such explosive levels that they may well interfere with the conduct of the war and the making of the peace.

Mr. Speaker, these conclusions concerning the character of the campaign being conducted by the Republican aspirant are based on a careful and searching scrutiny of everything he has said and done during his present tour, starting with the speech in Philadelphia. I do not base these conclusions on the utterances of his followers, his campaign managers, and the smaller fry surrounding him. I do not base them on the cloud of interpretation and explanation which precede and follow his utterances, but on them alone and on his actions.

I say that the underlying pattern of the Republican candidate's progress through the country is a deliberate effort to whip up disaffection with the conduct of the war. I ask you to examine with me a number of his statements and judge for yourself, by asking two simple questions of each:

First. Is it constructive and positive?

Second. Does it help or hinder the war effort by inciting passion and arousing group resentment?

I want you to examine three instances. In his Philadelphia speech the candidate made an unprincipled and false charge, based on the remark of a Republican Army officer, that this administration planned to keep men in the Army after the cessation of hostilities as an alternative to relief. The second is the gratuitous insertion of the Republican candidate into high military policy by his Valentine, Nebr., remarks urging General MacArthur for the command of the Pacific theater of war. Third, and more subtle and perhaps more destructive, has been the candidate's deliberate striking at the heart of the war effort on the home front into which he has traveled through championing the wildly inflationary demands of every disaffected group in every area through which he has traveled.

Let us look at these instances and consider their consequences—something which the Presidential aspirant deliberately ignored. The Philadelphia speech was presumably a delineation of the candidate's domestic program. It said nothing for he had no program to offer. It embraced the program already achieved by the Democratic Party, of course. It could do nothing less. Having nothing to say, having no positive program to offer the country, the Republican candidate then pulled out the one arrow in his quiver, the charge that the Roosevelt administration plans to delay the demobilization of the armed forces because it fears a depression.

What was this based on? On a remark made by the Director of Selective Service, a Regular Army officer who is a Republi-

can and whose job is not primarily concerned with making policy for demobilization.

I will pass over the fact that the day before his speech the Army had issued its plan for demobilization, based on the most democratic of all procedures, the desires of the men in the Army themselves. The Republican candidate had as evidence before him the official Army plan and the remark of an official, not previously identified with the Roosevelt administration and a Republican to boot.

Why did he choose the random remark of General Hershey as the sole evidence on which to base his charge? The answer is obvious. It was a calculated appeal to the fears and hopes of the mothers and fathers, the sisters and brothers and wives of servicemen, and to the servicemen themselves. The charge of delaying demobilization, which was the dominant note in the press throughout the Nation the following day, sought to convey the impression that the Republican candidate would deliver the servicemen home sooner, the further sinister implication that for political reasons the Democratic administration would delay their demobilization.

This is irresponsible political adventurism of the worst sort.

I suggest that you apply the tests which I have urged:

Was the speech constructive?

Of course not. No better evidence can be found than his sweeping conclusion in the same speech that when the W. P. B. "fell apart, so did your chance under this administration for jobs after the war." I need not answer this. Instead, I shall give you the answer of the Washington Post, an independent Republican paper.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just when did the Washington Post become an independent Republican paper or any other kind of a Republican paper?

Mr. PRIEST. I am only listing it as I believe it is generally listed in the American Newspaper Association. I cannot answer the gentleman as to when.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am just going by what it says and not how it is listed.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is applying the same test that I am applying in this speech to the candidate on the Republican ticket.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assume the gentleman understands that the editor of the Washington Post is a distinguished, well-known Republican who had some connection with a former Republican administration.

Mr. PRIEST. That was my understanding.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's address. It is the fourth or fifth that has been made by representatives of the New Deal Party on the floor of the House since the alleged Hershey utterance. It simply demonstrates that truism that it is the wounded bird that flutters. It is the wounded bird that flutters.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman for his comment. Before my time has concluded, I wanted to get to this quotation from the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] who is one of the ablest Republicans in the House, is trying to squirm out. Of course, the ridiculousness of Governor Dewey's statement has justified the argument, has made it so convincing, that a dead bird cannot answer back.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the majority leader. I now want to quote from the Washington Post.

The Post said:

Again events offer a rebuttal of (his) suggestion. In the first place, the W. P. B. has weathered the change of leadership without more than minor change in directional personnel. Secondly, the new Acting Chairman, Mr. J. A. Krug, had just announced that, after the collapse of Germany, there will be a slash of 40 percent of our war production, involving the release of 4,000,000 workers. Jobs in private industry will automatically be available for displaced workers in direct relation to this assurance of intention, coupled, as it is in this case, with the assurance of relaxation of W. P. B. controls. As it happens, a smooth transition from war to peace employment depends in greatest measure upon action on Capitol Hill on pending demobilization bills.

I particularly commend this next passage in the Post editorial:

A reminder of the need for haste and responsibility on the part of Congress would have been in order in the Philadelphia speech.

Did it arouse passion and resentment and hinder the war effort?

It would take an extremely insensitive person to fail to see the deliberate playing on strung nerves and deep sentiments that this appeal made.

I should like at this time to point out some of the more far-reaching implications of his charges and statements. The size of the Army and the date and manner of demobilization are military decisions. They depend on a complex of factors, many of them technical, but some of them so apparent that even irresponsible political adventurers can discern them. One of them is the size of this total war. The other is the necessity of maintaining a military force to assure the peace. Does this implied promise—never was it clearly stated by the Republican candidate—of early demobilization under a Republican regime mean that the Republican candidate is not interested in maintaining the peace?

I have called these charges irresponsible political adventurism. I do it advisedly and with some restraint. I do it because I am deeply concerned that a candidate for the highest office the coun-

try can bestow should in the midst of war make charges that are calculated to disaffect not only civilians behind the lines but the soldiers in the lines themselves. It is an attack on the war effort. I do not feel that such charges and such an attack are to be waved aside as youthful exuberance or the rodomontade of the hustings.

Nor am I alone in feeling that this is a fundamental attack on our war effort. The Washington Post, an independent Republican paper which has espoused the cause of the Republican candidate, in an editorial published last Saturday, September 9, 1944, stated:

The burden of the initial attack on Mr. Roosevelt was far from well advised. He chose to make an issue out of a demobilization plan which, in our opinion, is splendidly conceived in the national as well as the servicemen's welfare. * * * Not content with making a wise and bold transition scheme an issue, (he) proceeded to trace the dirty trail of New Deal politics in it. The charge on its face is unfounded. It is given on the authority of the Director of Selective Service, who has never been renowned for apt phraseology, but who happens to be a Republican.

And I particularly want you to mark the next words. The Post expects the Republican candidate will doubtless change his tack when he reads the demobilization plan and hears from his friends of General Hershey's Republican affiliations. It then goes on to say—and I deliberately emphasize these words:

But the change is required not only for reasons of political strategy. This war is not yet over, and it is damaging to the morale of the fighting soldiers to allege that this Government is playing politics with their demobilization. Already the feeling is to be encountered among the troops that demobilization may be politically delayed.

These are the words of a Republican newspaper, not mine. I should like to repeat them, however, for the benefit of those who, like children, will play with any instrument that comes to hand, regardless of the consequences to those about him:

This war is not yet over, and it is damaging to the morale of the fighting soldiers to allege that this Government is playing politics with their demobilization.

Mr. Speaker, let us now consider the comments of the Republican candidate at Valentine, Nebr. On Wednesday, September 13, the Republican candidate gratuitously inserted himself into two purely military problems. One was the choice of an over-all commander for the entire Pacific war for which he nominated General MacArthur. The other was criticism of the administration and its war effort for not giving General MacArthur enough supplies.

Such statements are irresponsible if made by anyone. That they should be made by one who devoted such praise in his acceptance speech to the military leadership of General Marshall and Admiral King, and who so pointedly spoke about keeping the military conduct of the war free from civilian interference, makes them vicious duplicity.

The Republican candidate knows nothing of the military situation in the Pa-

cific that would enable him to pass judgment on the choice of commander in chief.

The Republican candidate knows nothing of the military conduct of the war.

The Republican candidate knows nothing of the supplies given to General MacArthur.

The Republican candidate has not had the benefit of consultation with either General Marshall or Admiral King, whom he professes to admire, or their staffs.

For what purpose are these suggestions then, that General MacArthur be given the post of commander in the Pacific area, made by the Republican candidate? In suggesting General MacArthur the Republican Presidential candidate was not interested in furthering the progress of the war. Is it not obvious that the chief motivation for such a suggestion is wild criticism of the administration that will further inflame that section of the isolationists among his supporters who have been carefully nursing a grievance about the so-called mistreatment of the renowned general?

For whom is the Republican candidate speaking when he makes such suggestions? For the isolationists and bitter-enders who still fight our active participation in the war, or those Republicans who as good Americans want to prosecute this war to a quick victory? And what is the purport of his comments? Were they intended—as some say—to capitalize on the publicity of the Quebec meeting?

Again I suggest, look at his comment in the light of the two fundamental questions I have raised.

Is it constructive?

Does it hinder the war effort by arousing resentments?

These questions were both answered completely and decisively by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, writing on Saturday in that distinguished Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune. I quote from Major Eliot's remarks concerning what he calls the Republican candidate's gratuitous interference in the matter of the high command in the Pacific:

It may yet fall to the lot of (the Republican candidate) to bear the responsibility for choosing a commander in chief in the Pacific, or suggesting an American candidate for that office to the governments of the other allied powers; but until that time comes, and he is in possession of all the facts and all the professional advice necessary to guide him, it is a disservice to his country's cause for him to make widely publicized suggestions which can only add to the difficulties of those who, in the present critical days, are in fact charged with that responsibility.

Finally, I should like to call your attention to the more subtle manifestation of the Republican candidate's attacks on the war effort. He has been making use of an interesting technique. Throughout his journey in the West, the Republican candidate has been conferring with, and encouraging many groups and individuals who are disaffected by the rigors of the war. Then, the Republican candidate has freely voiced criticism

of the war effort, particularly on the home front, using the cloak of speaking in the name of those groups and individuals with whom he has conferred.

Thus, we have had the spectacle of the Republican candidate criticizing the war effort, but always in the name of the demands of cattle growers, of beet-sugar producers, and of all manner of others. He becomes, in the words of one reporter who has accompanied him, "the spokesman for their grievances."

It is an interesting device and known elsewhere. It is a technique calculated to do two things. It frees the Republican candidate from making any constructive proposals with respect to the subject of the grievances. And it enables the Republican candidate to make all manner of wild and dangerous claims and grievances without taking any personal or political responsibility for asserting these claims and grievances.

But this is of the very essence of political irresponsibility. For what is the effect of this technique?

Let me describe it to you in the words of an experienced political reporter who has seen him at first hand. It is the comment of Thomas L. Stokes, veteran political writer for the Scripps-Howard papers, which are not noted for their unfriendliness to the Republican candidate. Mr. Stokes said in a recent column:

He raised issues, but did not offer solutions. * * * But at the same time, he spread criticism of the New Deal, the restlessness under war restrictions, far and wide for its effect among the voters * * * just as effectively perhaps as if he had said all these harsh things on his own.

And this is the very heart of the matter. For the Republican candidate is preying upon the natural restlessness of all groups under war restrictions—mind you, not under New Deal restrictions, but under war restrictions, under controls which are imposed by the grim necessity of war. For the burden of these criticisms that are spread so sedulously and cultivated so carefully by the Republican candidate is that war controls must be brushed aside. Now—at the height of the war. I need not tell this body that if these war controls are thrust aside, it would result in a violent irruption of inflation that would seriously endanger the war effort.

Are these criticisms constructive? Obviously not. In the same breath that the Republican candidate finds no point in rationing beef because of the alleged 10,000,000 surplus of beef cattle roaming the ranges, he hedges by disclaiming a desire to do away with beef rationing. If you can find any meaning in this double talk, you are gifted with powers of clairvoyance which are beyond me.

Do the criticisms hinder the war effort by inflaming group resentment? There can be no question that they do, on the testimony of the most competent political writers who accompany the Republican candidate in his trek across the country.

There is something disquieting in the spectacle of a candidate so overcome with ambition for high office that he would

pull down the very structure of the Nation's morale, which is the heart of the war effort. And there is something dangerous for the future of the country, both in war and peace, in a candidate displaying such reckless disregard of the economic and political consequences of his statements, and at the same time such a calculated partisan adventurousness.

Perhaps there is a narrow political justification in the Republican candidate's lack of a constructive program, for the politician remains ever he who is all things to all men. And perhaps, too, the Republican candidate had adequate precedent for this lack of constructive vision in the Republican Party's platform which, as a number of commentators—none unfriendly—said at the time, was an elaborate catch-all, contrived so that suitable texts can be selected to support diametrically opposed views.

But it was to be expected that the Republican candidate would do more than lie on this amorphous platform. For his was the challenge presented to few men at such a point in history—a challenge to clarify the vision of the Nation, a challenge to strengthen the basic understanding of the American people concerning the role of America in war and peace.

But the Republican candidate has failed to accept this challenge, and has failed thereby to perform his duty to the American people. Instead he has deepened the confusion, sown more serious doubts in the minds of people, beclouded the vision of the Nation.

Mr. Walter Lippmann said of the Republican platform on July 1 that—

Quite apart from its intentional ambiguity on foreign policy, [it] is as regards domestic affairs as reckless and as mischievous as irresponsible politicians dared to make it. It is a blueprint for post-war inflation. It is an invitation to all the pressure groups, a permit to all weak-minded and chicken-hearted candidates for office, to plunge the country into the chaos of an uncontrolled and uncontrollable inflation of prices and wages.

Mr. Lippmann, in this same article, found this to be the dominant view, the real views of the Republicans. He hoped that the Republican candidate would find a way to turn the party in another direction. Instead, the Republican candidate, by his actions and speeches, tries with cold and desperate statements to drive the Nation further along the path to chaos laid down by the platform makers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes this afternoon following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have five unanimous consent requests to submit at this time: First, to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD the four campaign speeches made to date by Governor Dewey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the speeches of Governor Dewey have already been placed in the RECORD, so there is no use duplicating them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that if that is so it will be taken care of.

Mr. JENNINGS. I understood they had not been. If they have been that is something else.

Mr. McCORMACK. It will be taken care of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOCH] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR ARE ENTITLED TO RECOGNITION FOR PROMOTIONS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the membership of the House to a policy that I regard as being an unfair discrimination to members of our armed forces who are prisoners of war. I am advised, according to Army regulations, an officer or enlisted man who becomes a prisoner of the enemy through no fault of his own is not entitled to be given consideration for promotion during the period he is a prisoner of war.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this regulation is an extremely harsh one. I do not think it is fair because a man has taken the risks and hazards, and has suffered the consequences of becoming a prisoner of enemy forces, such experience ought to be used as a deterrent in preventing him from a chance for promotion that he might have had if he had not been captured.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we could make no mistake in giving recognition to these men by allowing them the promotions that might have been theirs if they had not been prisoners of war. Under the present policy it appears that being a prisoner of war works against a promotion rather than even giving the man an even chance. I understand, of course, these men may or may not have had promotions if they were not prisoners of war, but on the other hand, I think it is manifestly unfair that such men as the heroes of Guam, Wake Island, Corregidor, Bataan, and other places where our men have been taken prisoners by the enemy, that these men should not at least have this little recognition for the bravery and the sacrifices they made for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the question of promotions ought to be left with those in

charge of the armed forces, and, generally speaking, such promotions ought to be earned on account of ability and faithfulness to duty. Certainly these thousands of heroes who are now in the prison camps of the enemy were faithful to duty to the very last. I have no criticism of the hundreds of promotions in the Pentagon and in other places that take place every day, but while such consideration is being given why not permit a little recognition to men who are not in position to speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, legislation is now pending before the House on this subject. Senate bill 1374, dealing with this problem, passed the other body by unanimous vote a few days ago. I am informed the principal criticism of the Secretary of War to such legislation is "there might be no way to distinguish between those men who by virtue of having fought to the last might be deserving of a reward in the form of promotion and those who surrendered in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there are many boys in our armed forces who would not continue to resist to the last ditch, thinking there might be a chance for promotion if they become prisoners of the Germans or Japanese. The granting of this recognition to those boys in the prison camps of the enemy would build their morale and offer encouragement more than we can realize.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will give this legislation the meritorious consideration to which it is entitled. I hope it may be passed without too much further delay. While we are granting promotions to soldiers in the Pentagon and in other places in this country, why not give favorable consideration to the approval of promotions to soldiers in Bataan, Wake Island, Corregidor, and other enemy bastilles.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the people at home sent us to Congress to make, insofar as our abilities may permit, statesmanlike utterances. I regret to see the House of Representatives used as a sounding board for politics; I dislike to see the debate in the House degenerate to the point of taking "cracks" at personalities who are running for high office in this land of ours. I regret that the Governor of New York, the Republican nominee for President, has to be subjected to some of the uncalled-for criticisms that he has suffered on the House floor and elsewhere because of the fact that he has dared to go out and criticize those who have to do with the administration of the Nation's affairs today. Mr. Speaker, all one has to do is to review the record which the Governor of New York has made in his own State. As a young man, as the district attorney of New York County, he went into New York City and cleaned out a veritable nest of the most vicious rats and racketeers that this country had ever known. He reduced the crime situation in New

York City from one of the worst that the country had ever known to its present bettered status. So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that when he has dared, like David of old, to raise his voice against some of the Goliaths in the Government today, he has to suffer the backfire, and unfortunate criticisms that have been leveled at him recently.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is that not one of the prices that any man pays for rendering a public service?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is.

Mr. JENNINGS. It does not hurt. It is like shooting an elephant with a peablower.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. It will make the candidate on the Republican ticket for President all the stronger; nevertheless, there are those who will rise up in indignation and come to his defense. I confess, that as far as I am concerned, he does not need any defense which I may be able to give to him because he is perfectly able, as has been demonstrated in his campaign speeches, to take care of himself. He has been chosen by a higher power above to point out the transgressions and the mistakes which are rife in our Government today. I feel doubly sure that after he has been elected President of the United States in the November election he will come forth and clear the way, just as he has in New York as the chief executive of that State, in the Capital of the United States and do away with all the deadwood and all the unnecessary ruffles that have been added by the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am not resorting to political references. I repeat that I do not think we should use the well of this House as a political sounding board, but that statesmanship, insofar as we are able to execute it, should take preference and priority. I simply want to point out the situation as I see it, and I know that the Governor of New York will make an excellent President.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take away from the entertaining political discussions to call attention to what I think is a real and threatening danger to our war program as we near the collapse of Germany and the victory on the European front.

Unless all signs that I can read in Washington newspapers and other publicity are mistaken, we face very shortly the most determined drive yet made to break through price control. We have faced, as you Members of the House know, many, many frontal attacks by powerful groups in this country with various degrees of economic interest. Today, luckily, through strong adminis-

tration and through courage on the part of the Congress in meeting these problems, we have written a record of inflation control that the Congress can well be proud of. But we are not yet through with the war.

I say to you that if the Little Steel formula is broken in the near future we will see the dynamiting of the price-control dam.

I think it is fundamental that you cannot control prices of commodities, the prices that go into the cost of living, unless you also control the cost of the labor that produces them. To take off the ceilings that we now have on wages that go into the cost of production of commodities, and in the cost of living, we will find that we have dynamited away half of the dam that holds back the devastation of the flood of inflation.

I hope the Members of the Congress will inform themselves more of this danger and realize that only by "holding the line" until we have passed beyond the war emergency can we hope to avoid the curse and devastation of wartime inflation that has marked every war in the history of this Nation.

If we have the nerve to hold that line a few more months, until economic conditions can come somewhere near a balance of demand and supply, then we will get through this war without adding untold billions of dollars of cost to Federal expenditures and without the danger and damage that occurs during a war in wiping out the securities and savings of the millions of little people of this Nation.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of the city of Beardstown, Ill.

URGING SUPPLEMENTAL MILK SUBSIDIES FOR THE DROUGHT-STRICKEN DAIRYMEN OF DELAWARE COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on a nonpartisan issue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am a man of my word, and I shall proceed, therefore, to make a nonpartisan address irrespective of the partisan political speeches that have been made here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and distinction to represent a great dairy district, one of the largest dairy districts in the United States of America, if not in the world, which includes Delaware County, the largest single milk-produc-

ing county in the East and second only to Los Angeles County in the United States. That county, surrounded by the counties of Sullivan, Orange, Ulster, and Chenango, apparently is being discriminated against. These counties that surround it, which I have just mentioned, have been given a 10-cent supplemental milk subsidy payment, amounting altogether to 80 cents a hundred, because they are in a drought area, but Delaware County, the greatest of them all in the production of fluid milk, has not yet been included in that drought area.

I see no reason for this discrimination whatsoever. The dairymen there have done a great job during the war in spite of a shortage of labor and agricultural equipment to produce more milk and not less. They have helped to feed the American people, our own armies, and even the armies of our allies, while their sons have been fighting in our own armed forces.

American farmers have done a wonderful job throughout the Nation in producing more and more farm products during the war. They have done an almost incredible and almost miraculous job of producing more farm products than ever before, in spite of all their wartime handicaps and restrictions, and I hope that the program of abundance will continue and that we will not go back to a program of scarcity, plowing under of crops, and slaughter and birth control of pigs.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee. It is our function to try to solve that tremendous problem of conversion from wartime to peacetime production for agriculture. We have only just begun to study that vital and far-reaching issue and to try and help solve the farm problem so that after this war we shall not be confronted with the same disastrous conditions we faced after the last war, when scores of thousands of farmers were forced off their farms and had them sold under their own eyes.

Mr. Speaker, all the farmers are asking for is equality, parity in prices between themselves and industry and labor, which they have not been receiving. That is why it is necessary to give them these milk subsidies and the supplemental subsidies in the drought areas, so that they can continue to produce milk at a reasonable profit and not at a loss.

As a general proposition, we Republicans are not in favor of subsidies. We believe the farmers should receive fair, adequate, and just prices, prices that compare with those of labor and industry. Until that time comes, of course, we must continue milk subsidies, particularly as part of the war effort and the higher costs of production. But as long as the Federal Government is granting milk subsidies and as long as these adjoining counties are receiving those subsidies and in addition a supplemental subsidy of 10 cents a hundred in drought areas, I do not understand this discrimination against the dairymen of Delaware County, the greatest milk-producing county in the United States with the

exception of Los Angeles. I hope the Government officials will see the light in the next few days and change their program and include Delaware County in the drought area. Their fields have been singed and burned, their hay crops jeopardized and milk production curtailed.

The farmers and dairymen of Delaware County will continue, as they have in the past, to produce milk for the war emergency, but I think they should be rewarded for their successful contribution toward winning the war and not be discriminated against.

The purpose for which I rose today was to make this complaint and ask for immediate relief.

I have urged Mr. D. A. Fitzgerald, Deputy Director of Production of the War Food Administration, to review the drought conditions in Delaware County and to include it with Ulster, Sullivan, Orange, and Chenango Counties in the drought area for a 10-cent supplemental payment as of September 1, making the total 80 cents instead of 70 cents a hundred pounds.

The time is short and the need is immediate. I hope the War Food Administration will give them the supplementary increase of 10 cents within the next few days as a simple matter of justice. If the Office of War Food Administration fails to act or to provide this needed relief I shall take the matter up again and ask for further study of the conditions in Delaware by Director Marvin Jones of the War Food Administration until supplemental relief has been afforded to the drought-stricken dairymen of Delaware County.

I received yesterday the following telegram from Assemblyman Elmer J. Kellam of Delaware County: "Delaware County farmers dissatisfied that they are cut 10 cents per hundred on milk subsidy. Can you help them?" I replied immediately by telegram as follows: "Have been trying to have Delaware included in the drought area to secure 10 cents a hundred supplementary payment for the dairymen. Hope to have some favorable news within the next 24 hours. Will keep you informed. Please notify farm leaders and organizations."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. The remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York with reference to the condition existing in his district in the dairy industry is of great interest to me and to the people whom I have the honor to represent. The State of Tennessee has this year suffered the greatest drought in the history of the State. The production of hay and corn and other dairy feeds has fallen far below normal. Pastures were burned brown during a period this summer, when we ordinarily have an abundance of pasture which will sustain dairy herds and relieve the owners of such herds from undertaking to supply feed and hay during the pasture season. In addition to that, the hay crop, which is

ordinarily, especially in my section of the State, adequate for those in the dairy industry, is this year almost a total failure. On top of that, those who have heretofore been able to fill their silos with ensilage crops have not been able to, and will not be able to, fill their silos. Within the last 2 years the dairy industry in my State has had a phenomenal growth. It has increased many hundreds percent. We have some of the finest herds in the land in my home county of Knox. Yet, as a result of this drought and of the shortage of feed and the fact that dairymen can no longer produce milk at a profit, and if they produce it at all, it is at a heavy loss, some of the finest herds in my county have been sold at public auction.

Men have taken their milk cows to the packing houses, as a result of their inability to feed them. An application is now pending before the Office of Price Administration, on the part of the dairy industry in Tennessee—when I say that, I mean the industry throughout the entire State—for such an increase in price to the producers of milk as will enable them to stay in business. Unless the relief asked for by these dairymen is accorded them, and at once, the dairy industry in my State will suffer irreparable injury. The men and women who have put their life's energy and toil and savings into dairy equipment and in dairy herds, will be ruined. I know of one instance where a man in my county, who, prior to the time this drought hit him, had a herd of cattle, not all dairy cattle, but for the most part dairy cattle, some of them were beef cattle, which he valued and could have sold readily at a price of \$10,000, who today would be glad to dispose of his cattle for \$2,500. Seven thousand five hundred dollars is more than the average farmer can afford to lose. Now, this situation can be met without a loss to anyone. There is being shipped into my district now from Wisconsin, milk to furnish the war workers, some 40,000 of them, who are employed on one project within 30 miles of my home town. It will be a calamity if the dairy industry in my State is destroyed by reason of this drought and by reason of a set of circumstances for which these people are in nowise to blame and over which they have no control. The Office of Price Administration should take immediate and effective action to relieve the people in the drought area, which embraces not only Tennessee, but also Kentucky and Alabama. Such action will conserve both the dairy industry and the health of the people in these States. A further delay will mean disaster such as has not been suffered by any people of this country since the Federal Government has undertaken to control the prices of farm products.

Not only will a great industry be destroyed but the health of the people will be seriously impaired.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlemen from Tennessee has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include two editorials from today's Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5125. An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2707. An act for the relief of Henry White; and

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on September 19, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Freda Utley;

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 1434. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kohler;

H. R. 1623. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548-555);

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1708. An act for the relief of Perley M. Silver;

H. R. 2134. An act for the relief of Paul Szeliga;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2509. An act for the relief of Marie Engert;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Karl, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Tressie Spring and Mrs. Hazel Stutte;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3464. An act for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottko;

H. R. 3722. An act to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival;

H. R. 4257. An act to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service;

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 5025. An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War No. 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1851. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1852. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a revised estimate form of the ceiling unit working funds, Weather Bureau, for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, which is to be substituted for the estimate form submitted with the letter of September 9, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGEEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 2069. An act for the relief of Irma S. Sheridan, postmaster at Rockville, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 5407. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the development and improvement of devices for the propulsion of aircraft, for national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5408. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, to provide a method for accomplishing certain mustering-out payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5409. A bill for the exchange of lands adjacent to the Pike National Forest in Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5410. A bill to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irrigation, generation, and distribution of power, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5411. A bill to create and expand post-war employment and opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5412. A bill relating to the effect of discovery and percentage depletion on the

computation of the net operating loss carry-over and carry-back under certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5414. A bill to authorize the construction of a marine hospital in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 5415. A bill to establish a game farm in Orange County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5416. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5417. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5418. A bill providing for the release of married enlisted men from active service in the United States Army who have attained the thirty-fifth anniversary of their birth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 5419 (by request). A bill relating to the status of Keetoowah Indians of the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Jason Meth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5422. A bill for the relief of Harry Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of James R. Lally; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Allen P. Pitsenbarger; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

6166. By Mr. BUCKLEY. Petition of Louis C. Sbordy and 745 other citizens protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6167. By Mr. KLEIN. Petition of H. L. Taylor and sundry other New York citizens, protesting against any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Friday, September 1, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, Thou art our strong arm every morning and our salvation in time of trouble. Even as we